LIBRARY OF NEW TESTAMENT STUDIES

THE LAZARUS STORY WITHIN THE JOHANNINE TRADITION

WENDY E. SPROSTON NORTH

t&t clark

JOURNAL FOR THE STUDY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT
SUPPLEMENT SERIES
212

Executive Editor
Stanley E. Porter

Editorial Board
Elizabeth A. Castelli, David Catchpole, Kathleen E. Corley,
R. Alan Culpepper, James D.G. Dunn, Craig A. Evans,
Stephen Fowl, Robert Fowler, George H. Guthrie,
Robert Jewett, Robert W. Wall

Sheffield Academic Press

The Lazarus Story within the Johannine Tradition

Wendy E. Sproston North

Journal for the Study of the New Testament
Supplement Series 212

In Memory of Betty Smith

Copyright © 2001 Sheffield Academic Press

Published by
Sheffield Academic Press Ltd
Mansion House
19 Kingfield Road
Sheffield S11 9AS
England

www.SheffieldAcademicPress.com

Typeset by Sheffield Academic Press

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available
from the British Library

EISBN 9781841271958

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments 7
Abbreviations 8
Introduction 11

Chapter 1
JOINT WITNESSES TO WHAT WAS FROM THE BEGINNING 17
Investigating 1 John in Relation to the Gospel 22
The Character of the Epistle 25
Linking Gospel and Epistle 31
Conclusions 38
Putting Theory into Practice 40

Chapter 2
JESUS' LOVE FOR LAZARUS 41
Love in the Johannine Tradition 42
The Tradition on Love in the Lazarus Story 49

Chapter 3
FROM DEATH TO LIFE 58
Eschatology in 1 John: A Shared Tradition 62
John 5.24 in Synoptic Perspective 71
John 5.24-29: Tradition and Interpretation 81
The Tradition on Life in the Lazarus Story 91

Chapter 4
JESUS' PRAYER 102
Martha's 'Confession' 106
Jesus' Prayer in Context 114

Chapter 5
THE MAKING OF THE LAZARUS STORY 118
Martha and Mary 118
Lazarus 119
Bethany 121
Links with Synoptic Raising Accounts 122

Links with Other Johannine Narratives 123
'The Jews' 124
John's Source for the Miracles 128
Preparation and Planning 130
Preface (10.40-42) 131
Introduction: Characters and Themes (11.1-4) 134
Delay (11.5-6) 136
Call to Martyrdom (11.7-16) 138
Life-Giver (11.17-27) 141
'All Change' (11.28-31) 145
Life Given (11.32-37) 146
Life Gained (11.38-44) 154

Conclusion 162
Bibliography 164
Index of References 173
Index of Authors 182

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This book began as a doctoral thesis submitted to the University of Wales, Bangor in 1997. I am grateful to the British Academy whose generous funding made the research possible. Also, I am deeply indebted to Professor Max Wilcox, under whose inspired guidance points first became stars, and whose unfailing support and encouragement have been a constant stimulus. Others who had chapters thrust at them and kindly gave their time and the benefit of their comments include the late Professor Barnabas Lindars, Professor Andrew Lincoln and Dr Ruth Edwards. Nor did my former colleagues in the Theology Department at Hull escape this doom. I wish to thank Dr David Bagchi and particularly Professor Lester Grabbe, among whose many kindnesses must be counted his unhesitating commitment of departmental resources to facilitate the production of this book. For special courage under fire, however, I commend my husband Dr Lionel North, in sharing hearth and home with the problem. Meanwhile, two wise and patient daughters, Clare and Joanna, gave every sympathy to bulletins of my progress and sensibly got on with life.

In a sense, this book also had a much earlier beginning. It is dedicated to my late mother who, like many of her generation, had the talent but not the breaks. To her indomitable courage, arch wit, and unshakeable belief in a better future, I owe more than I can say.

Wendy E. Sproston North

ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Anchor Bible
AnBib	Analecta biblica
BAGD	Walter Bauer, William F. Arndt, F. William Gingrich and Frederick W. Danker, *A Greek–English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2nd edn, 1979)
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium
BJRL	*Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester*
BNTC	Black's New Testament Commentaries
BS	The Biblical Seminar
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
EBib	Etudes bibliques
ExpTim	*Expository Times*
HeyJ	*Heythrop Journal*
HTKNT	Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
ICC	International Critical Commentary
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JJS	*Journal of Jewish Studies*
JSNT	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament*
JSNTSup	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, Supplement Series
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
LD	Lectio divina
MNTC	Moffat New Testament Commentary
NA^{27}	*Novum Testamentum Graece* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 27th edn, 1993 [1898])
NCB	New Century Bible
Neot	*Neotestamentica*
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NIDNTT	Colin Brown (ed.), *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology* (4 vols.; Grand Rapids: Zondervon, rev. edn. 1986–92)
NovT	*Novum Testamentum*
NovTSup	*Novum Testamentum*, Supplements
NTG	New Testament Guides
NTOA	Novum Testamentum et orbis antiquus

NTS	*New Testament Studies*
NTT	New Testament Theology
NTTS	New Testament Tools and Studies
RevQ	*Revue de Qumran*
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLSBS	Society of Biblical Literature Sources for Biblical Study
SCC	Studies in Creative Criticism
SHR	Studies in the History of Religions
SJT	*Scottish Journal of Theology*
SNTA	Studiorum Novi Testamenti Auxilia
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
TDNT	Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich (eds.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley; 10 vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76)
TZ	*Theologische Zeitschrift*
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZNW	*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*

Such is the multiplicity of levels at which the fourth Gospel can be appreciated, it has been likened to a magic pool in which children can paddle and elephants can swim.[1] On this analogy, 1 John probably rates somewhere near a bird-bath. With a theology at once shallower and muddier than the Gospel's, a prologue which resembles an obstacle course, and an argument which is often a triumph of imprecision, the epistle writer's work offers no competition to that of the evangelist.[2] As the lesser Johannine piece in all possible senses, the epistle is usually regarded as relating to the Gospel in some satellite or ancillary fashion. For example, it has been proposed that the relative crudity of the epistle indicates that it antedates the Gospel as a 'trial run' for the great work.[3] An alternative view is that it was designed as a 'companion piece' to the bigger volume, perhaps to introduce and recommend it.[4] A third position, which is by far the most commonly held, is that the epistle came after the Gospel and was written in direct support and defence of its theology in a newly developed situation of schism. Undoubtedly the most influential proponent of this third approach is Raymond Brown

1. See M.W.G. Stibbe, 'The Elusive Christ: A New Reading of the Fourth Gospel', *JSNT* 44 (1991), pp. 19-37 (37), now reprinted in *idem* (ed.), *The Gospel of John as Literature: An Anthology of Twentieth-Century Perspectives* (NTTS, 17; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1993), pp. 231-47.

2. For these and further disparaging remarks, see, e.g., J.L. Houlden, *A Commentary on the Johannine Epistles* (BNTC; London: A. & C. Black, rev. edn, 1994), pp. 45-47; R.E. Brown, *The Epistles of John* (AB, 30; London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1983), pp. 24, 174. As implied here, it will be assumed in what follows that Gospel and epistle were not by the same author.

3. See K. Grayston, *The Johannine Epistles* (NCB; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1984), pp. 12-14.

4. See T. Okure, *The Johannine Approach to Mission: A Contextual Study of John 4:1-42* (WUNT, 31; Tübingen: J.C.B Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1988), pp. 240, 254-56, 262. See further Brown, *Epistles*, p. 90 n. 207; J.M. Lieu, *The Theology of the Johannine Epistles* (NTT; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), p. 7.

who, in his massive Anchor Bible commentary on the epistles, has argued the case in considerable detail. Thus, Brown's proposal is important not only because it typifies the general view of the epistle's dependency on the Gospel but also because it represents the most significant attempt to come to terms with the complexity of the evidence. It is in our interest, therefore, to take careful note of his argument.[5]

Brown assumes that the epistle was written about a decade after the Gospel, by which time, he judges, the conflict over Johannine values within the community had reached the state of schism referred to in 1 Jn 2.19. He also assumes that the Gospel was regarded by all concerned in the fray as the community's foundational document. By carefully noting and categorizing those attitudes that the epistle writer appears to reject, Brown reconstructs the theological stance of 1 John's opponents, identifying them as Johannine Christians with an exaggeratedly high Christology and a distinct leaning in a gnosticizing direction. Thus, 1 John's text betrays evidence of two opposing groups: one represented by the author and his adherents and the other by the 'secessionists' who have recently left. Each group is interpreting the Johannine tradition according to its own lights and each group is justifying its position by appeal to that tradition as encapsulated in the Gospel. In the epistle writer's message to his readers, therefore, we encounter only the arguments of one side in this conflict buttressed by exposition of the Gospel text. However, Brown sees no reason why the same reliance on Gospel teaching cannot also have been characteristic of the opposite camp. In the case of the Johannine version of the love command, for example, there was nothing to prevent members of either group from practising the commandment to love one another while, at the same time, engaging in vehement opposition to others perceived to be outside that charmed circle. Brown observes that this much, at least, is true of 1 John's own response to the situation.

These views on the affiliation and polemical character of the epistle are worked through in Brown's detailed exegesis of the text. This is tackled from a double perspective. First, because he holds that 1 John has deliberately assumed the mantle of the evangelist, Brown systematically interprets the epistle's teaching against the wider background of the Gospel. He takes it for granted that where the epistle comes into agreement with the Gospel, a direct reference to the evangelist's text is

5. For the argument in full, see Brown, *Epistles*, pp. 49-115.

intended.[6] Even where Gospel terminology is used in the epistle with undeniable differences in meaning, Brown holds his course, explaining such changes as instances of reinterpretation.[7] He even claims that the structure of 1 John, which is notoriously difficult to determine, is deliberately modelled on that of the Gospel.[8] Second, because Brown also holds that the epistle writer's argument is framed with direct reference to the teachings of those who have 'gone out', those points where the epistle is at variance with the Gospel can also be explained along these lines. Thus, if 1 John appears to avoid Gospel terminology or to prefer a non-Gospel word, this is because of his determination to stress his own position against the theology of his opponents as Brown has reconstructed it.[9]

Brown's thesis is argued with characteristic thoroughness and attention to detail and is entirely logical within its own terms. Unfortunately, however, it is also methodologically unsound and completely unrepresentative of the epistle writer's actual position. It is methodologically unsound because it involves reconstructing the beliefs of 1 John's adversaries from the epistle writer's text and then using the reconstruction to interpret the epistle writer's text. This is to argue in a circle, surely the least convincing means of interpreting a text and not to be contemplated unless all else fails.[10] To add to the difficulty, it appears that there is insufficient evidence in 1 John's text to justify such a procedure in any case. As Judith Lieu has successfully shown, the epistle writer's message is primarily concerned with reassuring his own group in the wake of the schism and not with polemizing against its past members.[11] A second failure on Brown's part to come to terms

6. See, e.g., on 1 Jn 3.12 (= Jn 8.39-44; 13.2, 27) and on 1 Jn 3.16 (= Jn 15.12-13) (Brown, *Epistles*, pp. 468, 474).

7. Note, e.g., his position on 'the word of life' in 1 Jn 1.1 (Brown, *Epistles*, p. 182).

8. See Brown, *Epistles*, pp. 91-92, 124-28.

9. For example, Brown conjectures that 1 John's choice of the non-Gospel κοινωνία (1 Jn 1.3, 6, 7) shows a deliberate preference for an expression the 'secessionists' would not have used (*Epistles*, pp. 186-87).

10. For this point, see Lieu, *Theology*, pp. 15-16. For the same method of reconstructing the opposition's 'boasts', see J. Painter, 'The "Opponents" in 1 John', *NTS* 32 (1986), pp. 48-71.

11. J.M. Lieu, 'Authority to Become Children of God: A Study of 1 John', *NovT* 23 (1981), pp. 210-28. See also Ruth Edwards's support of Lieu's position against

with the epistle is to ignore the fact that its author conveys not the slightest impression that he is conscious of the weight of the evangelist's mantle on his shoulders. 1 John does not refer to the Gospel, nor does he appear to derive his authority from the evangelist's text. On the contrary, he makes it abundantly clear that his qualification to speak to the matter in hand consists in his link with the tradition 'from the beginning' (1.1-3). We recognize, of course, that of the two authors he is by far the less able, but that is beside the point: 1 John's confidence in his capacity to meet his community's needs in a time of crisis, and to do so on the basis of the claims in his prologue, remains a factor to be reckoned with. This attitude need not automatically imply that the epistle writer could not have known the evangelist's text. Given that on other grounds it is entirely likely that the Gospel came first, such an argument would be unrealistic. However, it does seriously call into question Brown's assumption that 1 John's work was written with direct reference to that of his predecessor and was intended to be interpreted in that light. What finally undoes Brown's neat scheme is the fact that the epistle writer is perfectly capable of referring to tradition which the Gospel does not contain. Brown does his best with this, explaining that at points the epistle writer seeks to circumvent his opponents' claims by going back beyond the Gospel to more ancient Johannine tradition.[12] However, as we have seen, there is no guarantee that 1 John's every move was a knee-jerk response to the opinions of his adversaries. Moreover, as we have also seen, 1 John's first message to his readers is to lay claim to a knowledge of the Johannine tradition from its inception. Yet again, Brown has failed to take the epistle writer at his word. The fact that 1 John appeals to tradition not in the Gospel is consistent with his stand in the prologue and requires no special pleading; what is inconsistent in this context is Brown's assumption that he would appeal to tradition only if, for some reason, the Gospel text were unavailable to him.

Thus, for all Brown's careful scholarship, it appears that the case for the epistle's direct dependence on the Gospel is not proven. The purpose of this book is to propose and explore an alternative view. What now follows is a historical-critical study in which John and 1 John both figure. In Chapter 1 I attempt to establish that Gospel and epistle relate

Brown's in her book, *The Johannine Epistles* (NTG; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), pp. 64-65.

12. See Brown, *Epistles*, pp. 97-100 and p. 336 on ἀντίχριστος.

to one another indirectly by virtue of their common reliance on the Johannine Christian tradition. On that basis, I claim that 1 John can provide a secure and effective means of isolating tradition in the evangelist's text and thus significantly improve our chances of understanding the creative processes that went into the making of the fourth Gospel.[13] In the remaining four chapters, that claim is put to the test in the case of John's account of the raising of Lazarus. Chapters 2 to 4 deal with three separate aspects of the narrative in John 11, in which appeal to 1 John serves in each case to identify the tradition which is being expounded. In the final chapter, I attempt a description of the making of the Lazarus story in its entirety by combining the findings of the three studies using 1 John with what can be deduced by comparison with other resources of a narrative type in the Synoptics and elsewhere in John's Gospel. The book concludes with a brief discussion of the results of the research and some indication of other areas of study of the Gospel in which the tradition links with 1 John could be used to effect.

13. This chapter is an adaptation of my article 'Witnesses to What was ἀπ' ἀρχῆς: 1 John's Contribution to Our Knowledge of Tradition in the Fourth Gospel', published in *JSNT* 48 (1992) pp. 43-65 (repr. in S.E. Porter and C.A. Evans [eds.], *The Johannine Writings: A Sheffield Reader* [BS, 32; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995] pp. 138-60).

Chapter 1

JOINT WITNESSES TO WHAT WAS FROM THE BEGINNING

The distance from the Synoptics to John's Gospel often seems not so much a step as a quantum leap, for while John also records the life of the historical Jesus he seems to have conceived of its significance independently and on a vastly different scale. As a result the final overall effect is one of transformation and change, and perhaps no more strikingly so than in his presentation of Jesus himself. According to John, Jesus' story begins not in earthly time but with God before all time, and his entry into Palestinian society is the entry of the divine Word into human history. As the Word become flesh Jesus wields the power of God with conscious majesty, seemingly oblivious to human doubt. No intriguing 'messianic secret' keeps the reader guessing about Jesus' identity. On the contrary, his identity, origin and destiny are here openly proclaimed and attention is focused instead on human response to him. For all who encounter Jesus in John a final choice has to be made between stark alternatives—life or death, salvation or condemnation—because by virtue of his very presence in the world the conditions of judgment day have come into force. This is powerful and arresting imagery, but in fact what we see here probably has little to do with the historical Jesus; rather, it is the construct of a remarkable mind which has taken Jesus' story and set it within the framework of God's own confrontation with the world he created, loves and wishes to save. Even in these few brief remarks the distinctiveness of John's approach becomes apparent and we are easily persuaded that this fourth Gospel has been executed by a highly original and adventurous exponent of the genre. And yet, eccentric though John's contribution may seem in this context, the mere fact that he has undertaken to produce a Gospel, rather than a dogmatic treatise, has important implications for our attempts to understand his thinking. Specifically, it suggests that John's originality does not consist in inventing *de novo*, but that he has

created his Gospel by a process of expanding and expounding on a tradition already known to him as a Christian before he took up his pen.

This view of John as a receiver and interpreter of tradition finds confirmation in certain editorial comments and attitudes in the Gospel itself. As regards his awareness of tradition, it should not be missed that John himself records that the disciples not only witnessed Jesus' words and deeds but also *remembered* them after the event, a remembrance which would subsequently be informed by greater understanding (2.22; 12.16).[1] Furthermore, John's comments in 20.30-31 leave us in little doubt that he knew a number of miracle stories before he began writing, those recorded in the Gospel apparently being the result of the selection of such material as he deemed suitable to his purpose. However, there are other texts where John's self-perception as an interpreter of tradition is given prominence. The presentation of the so-called 'beloved disciple' is a good example of this attitude. This disciple is evidently intended as a key identity figure for Johannine Christianity and is frequently portrayed as the only one of Jesus' followers with the capacity to understand him and grasp his meaning. It is no accident, for example, that in 13.23 this disciple alone lies in Jesus' lap just as in 1.18 Jesus himself is described as in the lap of the Father whom he is uniquely able to interpret.[2] No doubt also the detail on the function of the Spirit-Paraclete in imparting to the faithful a new and hitherto unavailable insight into Jesus' words and deeds would be pointless if John had not thought of himself as a beneficiary of the Spirit's exegetical guidance.[3]

From our point of view this evidence is valuable because it provides an insight into what has gone into the making of the fourth Gospel. On

1. Compare also the injunction to remember Jesus' word in 15.20.

2. Note also the beloved disciple's access to 'inside information' in 13.25-26, his intuitive grasp of the meaning of the discarded graveclothes in 20.8-9 and his quick recognition of the risen Jesus in 21.7. As Mary's adopted son (19.26-27) he is to be seen as Jesus' *Doppelgänger* who faithfully reflects his character and intentions. The overall intention here seems to be to promote the Johannine ideal. See further, K.B. Quast, *Peter and the Beloved Disciple: Figures for a Community in Crisis* (JSNTSup, 32: Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), esp. pp. 159-62.

3. For descriptions of the Spirit's exegetical functions see 14.26; 15.26; 16.12-15. R.E. Brown's comment on this captures the implications well: 'The Fourth Evangelist must have regarded himself as an instrument of the Paraclete when in G John he reported what Jesus said and did but at the same time completely reinterpreted it' (*Epistles*, p. 287).

this basis we may be confident that two elements will be present in John's text: on the one hand there will be material known from tradition and, on the other, there will be the fruits of John's own creative interpretation of that tradition. It follows, therefore, that one very valid point of entry into understanding the workings of John's mind will be provided if we have some means of identifying in his text the tradition on which he has based his exegesis.[4]

However, all is not so simple. The problem is that the distinctive Johannine language and style do not alter significantly throughout the entire Gospel.[5] So consistent is the style, in fact, that translators are occasionally left simply to guess where reported speech has ended and editorial comment has begun. Furthermore, the use and re-use of a limited and theologically orientated vocabulary strongly suggest a radical re-presentation of source material in the service of theme. None of this augurs well for the 'scissors and paste' approach to detecting John's source material. The stylistic integrity suggests that whatever John has known he has preferred to express in his own idiom.

4. This is not to defend the historical-critical method against all comers but merely to affirm its continuing value in John's case in the light of evidence in the text which points to the author's self-perception. However, no attempt to understand the mind of John can afford to ignore his immense literary talent, and I assume that the newer literary-critical approaches to interpreting John can inform already established methods and can in turn be informed by them. See R.A. Culpepper's excellent *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* (Foundations and Facets; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983), esp. his remarks on p. 5. See also, more recently, M.C. de Boer, 'Narrative Criticism, Historical Criticism, and the Gospel of John', *JSNT* 47 (1992), pp. 35-48 (repr. in S.E. Porter and C.A. Evans [eds.], *The Johannine Writings: A Sheffield Reader* [BS, 32; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995], pp. 95-108).

5. So E. Ruckstuhl, *Die literarische Einheit des Johannesevangeliums* (Freiburg: Paulus, 1951; repr.; NTOA, 5; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987). Ruckstuhl has added two appendices to the reprint. The first (pp. 291-303) is a revision of his list of Johannine style characteristics in *Einheit* itself, and the second (pp. 304-331) is a revision and German translation of his essay 'Johannine Language and Style: The Question of their Unity', in M. de Jonge (ed.), *L'évangile de Jean: Sources, rédaction, théologie* (BETL, 44; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1977), pp. 125-47. See further, E. Ruckstuhl and P. Dschulnigg, *Stilkritik und Verfasserfrage im Johannesevangelium: Die johanneischen Sprachmerkmale auf dem Hintergrund des Neuen Testaments und des zeitgenössischen hellenistischen Schrifttums* (NTOA; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991).

Moreover, the strong thematic interest leaves us with no guarantee that John's exegetical activity has not extended also to the source material itself, with the result that what finally appears in his text has already been recast, and is therefore an interpreted and modified version of what he knew. There is nothing here to encourage us to accept R.T. Fortna's viewpoint that it is possible to reconstruct intact out of John's text some fixed and extensive pre-Johannine *Grundschrift* ('foundation document').[6]

Another approach—and one which injects a proper note of objectivity into the proceedings—is to look beyond the bounds of the Gospel itself to other literature, for example the Synoptic tradition or the Pauline letters, to discover there some correspondence with Johannine statements and so attempt to establish by means of external controls the tradition which John as a fellow Christian is likely to have known and drawn on.[7] This is a well-tried method and the results can be

6. Despite heavy criticism along these lines of his earlier book, *The Gospel of Signs: A Reconstruction of the Narrative Source underlying the Fourth Gospel* (SNTSMS, 11; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), Fortna has not substantially modified his position in his later volume, *The Fourth Gospel and its Predecessor: From Narrative Source to Present Gospel* (Studies of the New Testament and its World; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1989), see esp. pp. 6-8. It is particularly unfortunate that he has not devoted more serious consideration to Ruckstuhl's detailed and swingeing criticisms of his handling of style characteristics (see Ruckstuhl, 'Johannine Language', pp. 129-41; and compare Fortna, *Predecessor*, p. 210 n. 509). For criticism of *Predecessor*, see the review by B. Lindars in *SJT* 43 (1990), pp. 526-27; B. Lindars, *John* (NTG; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), pp. 32-33; for some searing remarks on Fortna's attitude, see M. Hengel, *The Johannine Question* (London: SCM Press; Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1989), p. 201 n. 58.

7. See W.F. Howard, *The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation* (London: Epworth Press, 2nd edn, 1935), pp. 215-29; C.H. Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), pp. 335-65. Studies which appeal specifically to the Pauline tradition include M. Wilcox, 'The Composition of John 13.21-30', in E.E. Ellis and M. Wilcox (eds.), *Neotestamentica et Semitica: Studies in Honour of Matthew Black* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1969), pp. 143-56; P. Borgen, 'The Use of Tradition in John 12: 44-50', *NTS* 26 (1979–80), pp. 18-35; *idem*, 'John and the Synoptics: Can Paul Offer Help?', in G.F. Hawthorne and O. Betz (eds.), *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament: Essays in Honor of E. Earle Ellis for his 60th Birthday* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), pp. 80-94. As is well known, Barnabas Lindars published extensively in this area. For example, see his 'Traditions behind the Fourth Gospel',

extremely valuable, especially in those areas where John's text appears to correspond closely with the content of these other writings so that the required degree of adjustment to the Johannine idiom is comparatively minor. Much of John's miracles and Passion material has proved amenable to this approach, and even the highly compositional discourse material has to some extent been shown to rest on traditional Jesus sayings.[8]

Finally, however, it has to be questioned whether the actual extent of the tradition as John knew it can always be recovered by this means. Where verbal correspondence between John and the Synoptics is comparatively slight then some degree of speculation beyond these points of contact is inevitable.[9] Moreover, it appears that there is more than Synoptic-type tradition in John.[10] For example, there is no miracle in the Synoptics that compares with the changing of water into wine at Cana in John 2 or with the raising of Lazarus in chapter 11. And how

in C.M. Tuckett (ed.), *Essays on John by Barnabas Lindars* (SNTA, 17; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), pp. 87-104. See also B. Lindars, *Behind the Fourth Gospel* (SCC, 3; London: SPCK, 1971), esp. pp. 43-60.

8. See B. Lindars, 'Discourse and Tradition: The Use of the Sayings of Jesus in the Discourses of the Fourth Gospel', in Tuckett (ed.), *Essays*, pp. 113-29, also reprinted in S.E. Porter and C.A. Evans (eds.), *The Johannine Writings: A Sheffield Reader* (BS, 32; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), pp. 13-30; *idem*, *John*, pp. 36-37.

9. I am indebted to Professor Max Wilcox for the suggestion that Jn 15.13 may be a version of the Son of man logion in Mk 10.45. I note also that Barnabas Lindars published on this, see his 'Mark 10.45: A Ransom for Many', *ExpTim* 93 (1981–82), pp. 292-95; *idem*, *Jesus Son of Man* (London: SPCK, 1983), p. 79. While I would not disagree with this position, nevertheless it should be pointed out that actual verbal contact between the Markan and Johannine texts is almost non-existent.

10. This position is accepted even among those who argue that John composed his Gospel in direct dependence on one or more of the Synoptics. See F. Neirynck, 'John and the Synoptics', in M. de Jonge (ed.), *L'évangile de Jean: Sources, rédaction, théologie* (BETL, 44; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1977), pp. 73-106 (94); now reprinted and extended in F. van Segbroeck (ed.), *Evangelica: Gospel Studies – Études d'évangile. Collected Essays by Frans Neirynck* (BETL, 60; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1982), pp. 365-400; C.K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to St John* (London: SPCK, 2nd edn, 1978), p. 17; see esp. M.D. Goulder's proposals on Gospel interrelationships which allow much more freedom to John in this regard than to Matthew and Luke (*Luke: A New Paradigm* [2 vols.; JSNTSup, 20; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989], I, pp. 22-23).

do we come to terms with a passage such as Jn 3.16-21? This text is quintessentially Johannine and is usually assumed to represent, at least in part, the so-called Johannine kerygma.[11] The Synoptics cannot help us here, and, while similar statements in the Pauline corpus are enough to persuade us that John's is a version of a common early Christian tradition,[12] precisely what John knew, whether recast or not, continues to remain unclear.

Difficulties such as these serve to highlight the need for a control which is not only external to the Gospel but which is also party to its distinctive style and theological perspective. There is, in fact, one document which fulfils our present requirements. In vocabulary, style and theology its affinity with the fourth Gospel is undisputed and indeed unsurpassed by any other substantial document known to us. Its origin from within the same matrix which produced the Gospel is thereby declared, and its immediate intelligibility to the Johannine reader thereby guaranteed. It will be obvious by now that the document here referred to is 1 John.

The object of this chapter is to propose that the first Johannine epistle can serve as a control which will increase our understanding of the nature of the tradition that has gone into the fourth Gospel, and hence will also allow us to pry a little further into the thinking of its author. Thus, if we wish to learn more about tradition in John we must look first and foremost to 1 John.

Investigating 1 John in Relation to the Gospel

When we do turn to 1 John, however, we find that there is much which would seem to confuse our enterprise. We quickly discover that the

11. The phrase 'the Johannine kerygma' heads a section in R. Schnackenburg's commentary where he argues that 3.16-21 is part of a discourse composed by the evangelist which was based on kerygmatic material. See R. Schnackenburg, *The Gospel According to St John* (3 vols.; New York: Herder & Herder; London: Burns & Oates, 1968–82), I, p. 380. He and others take 3.16 to be the kernel of the Johannine Christian message. See Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, I, p. 398: G.R. Beasley-Murray, *John* (WBC, 36; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987), p. 51; B. Lindars, *The Gospel of John* (NCB; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1972), p. 24; Barrett, *Gospel*, p. 216; J.H. Bernard, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John* (2 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1928), I, p. 117.

12. See esp. Rom. 8.31-32; 2 Cor. 5.19; Gal. 1.4; 2.20; 4.4-5; 1 Tim. 1.15; 2.4; 3.16; Tit. 2.11.

author of the epistle has not obliged us with a straightforward second edition of the Gospel but that, instead, he has produced a piece which has an independence of its own.

If we read 1 John with the Gospel freshly in mind we are immediately struck by the absence of reference to what are often substantial areas of the Gospel text. No one, of course, would expect to find narrative here because the epistle is not a narrative piece, but the differences go much deeper than that. Where, we might ask, is the Gospel's identification of Jesus with the divine pre-existent λόγος ('word')? The epistle's λόγος τῆς ζωῆς ('word of life') (1.1) is hardly a substitute, especially as other references show that λόγος in the epistle means something like a preached message.[13] And where do we hear of Jesus as the Lamb of God, the Good Shepherd or the True Vine? Indeed, we search in vain for the whole Gospel presentation of Jesus as sole mediator between God and humanity, who is invested with power over all flesh to give life and to judge, and who declares his authority in the majesty of the 'I am' statements. There is no claim here, for example, that Jesus is the Light of the World but, instead, the epistle's first announcement is that God—and not Jesus—is light (1.5). We do get a description of Jesus as a παράκλητος ('paraclete') in 1 Jn 2.1, and this seems to provide some tenuous link with Jn 14.16 where Jesus promises that the Father will send the Spirit as ἄλλος παράκλητος ('another paraclete'), which implies that Jesus himself is also a paraclete. But then the Gospel goes into some detail in describing the functions of the Spirit as paraclete (14.16, 26; 15.26; 16.7), and this identification between Spirit and paraclete is unknown in 1 John.

Reversing the reading process by beginning with 1 John does not seem to improve matters, for the result is much the same. Indeed, considering that the epistle is about one-seventh of the length of the Gospel, the incidence of words it contains which are not to be found in

13. This meaning is explicit in 2.7 (see also 1.10; 2.5, 14; 3.18). Parallels in the body of the Gospel and elsewhere in the New Testament also support the meaning 'message' for λόγος in 1.1 rather than a reference to the personal Word of the Prologue (so Brown, *Epistles*, pp. 164-65; Grayston, *Epistles*, pp. 39-40). This is not the only instance where terminology familiar from the Gospel is invested with different meaning in 1 John. See further P. Bonnard's study of these 'mutations sémantiques' in 'La première épître de Jean: Est-elle Johannique?', in M. de Jonge (ed.), *L'évangile de Jean: Sources, rédaction, théologie* (BETL, 44; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1977), pp. 301-305.

the Gospel text is remarkably high (45 in all).[14] Some of these fit in well enough with the Gospel subject matter, but it is not difficult to find others, among them ἀνομία, ἀντίχριστος, βίος, δοκιμάζειν, ἱλασμός, and ψευδοπροφήτης ('lawlessness', 'antichrist', 'means of life', 'to test', 'expiation', and 'false prophet'), which would seem to indicate real differences.

Given that the epistle does not always reflect the contents of the Gospel, it will be in our interest to concentrate on what the two have in common. The material common to John and 1 John gives every indication of a strikingly close verbal correspondence. We can trace from one document to the other not only the same words but also often the same phrases, and sometimes even whole sentences.[15] Yet in this very feature there lies a further cause for confusion, for neither text will either introduce that common material or continue on from it in the same vein as the other. In each case, therefore, the setting and the surrounding argument are different. The following two examples will demonstrate the point.

If we compare the sentence Θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακεν πώποτε ('No one has ever seen God') in Jn 1.18 with θεὸν ουδεὶς πώποτε τεθέαται ('No one has ever beheld God') in 1 Jn 4.12 the correspondence is obvious.[16] But what is equally obvious is that beyond this point all correspondence ceases. For the evangelist the application of the statement is christological: he uses it as a basis to speak of Jesus as the sole exegete of the Father. This is not the case in 1 Jn 4.12. There the same sentence has been put in the context of the command to love one another and when, in 4.20, the theme of God's invisibility returns, the interest centres on loving one's brother whom one *has* seen.

In 1 Jn 3.14 we note the confident assertion ἡμεῖς οἴδαμεν ὅτι

14. See the relevant lists in R. Morgenthaler, *Statistik des neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes* (Zürich: Gotthelf, 3rd edn, 1982).

15. See the comprehensive lists in A.E. Brooke, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Johannine Epistles* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1957), pp. ii–iv; B.F. Westcott, *The Epistles of St John* (London: Macmillan, 3rd edn, 1892), pp. x1i–x1iii.

16. The change in the verb is not significant since no difference in meaning is intended. For the argument that this is true in general of Johannine deployment of these verbs, see Brown, *Epistles*, p. 162. 1 John's use of ὁρᾶν ('to see') as he returns to this theme at 4.20 demonstrates the point well.

μεταβεβήκαμεν ἐκ του θανάτου εἰς τὴν ζωήν ('We know that we have passed out of death into life'). Its equivalent is recognizable in the Gospel text at 5.24: μεταβέβηκεν ἐκ του θανάτου εἰς τὴν ζωήν ('s/he has passed out of death into life'). In 1 Jn 3.11-18 we find the epistle writer once again concerned with the implications of the love command, and, to that end, this affirmation of the Christian status is directly related to that command in 3.14. In Jn 5.24, however, the love command is not in view. Instead, all hinges on hearing Jesus' word and believing the Father who sent him, by which means judgment is avoided and life guaranteed.

Thus, if we expect the epistle to have a consistent bearing on the Gospel, we will be disappointed. What we have, in fact, are two texts which have evidently issued from the same matrix but which make real contact with one another only intermittently and otherwise can seem to have little or nothing in common. It follows that the degree to which we can allow 1 John to function as a control to isolate tradition in the Gospel will depend on our reaching a much more precise understanding of how the contents of the two documents relate to one another.

The clue to the relationship between the two lies, in fact, in the nature and character of the epistle itself, and hence I will now look more closely at 1 John in order to learn a little more about it.

The Character of the Epistle

There is evidence in the epistle of a recent schism within the community. It seems that there has been a conflict over christological doctrine (2.22-24; 4.2-3) and several of the group's members have left (2.19). This suggests that what our author is obliged to tackle is the backlash of an exclusively Christian versus Christian controversy. Consequently we find him intent on assuring those who have remained that they alone hold to a proper understanding of the Johannine faith,[17] while also offering advice on how to live out that faith in these new and uncongenial circumstances.

Now this 'in house' controversy does not appear to correspond with the circumstances which precipitated the publication of the Gospel. The Gospel betrays evidence of the community's recent estrangement from contemporary Judaism and of a hostility between Jew and Christian

17. On this, see Lieu, 'Authority', p. 226.

Jew. In the case of the epistle, however, hostility has entered the very ranks of the community and appears to have arisen as a consequence of its own Christian beliefs.[18] At the outset, therefore, we should be aware that the problems which the epistle writer is concerned to resolve will not correspond with those which beset the evangelist. Nevertheless, the clue to the epistle's relationship to the Gospel does lie in this area. It is not contained in the fact of the schism itself nor in what may have led to it, but it is to be found in the particular method by which the author proceeds with his task of reassuring his own group in the aftermath of the trauma. I will now turn to examine this method in some detail.

The author of 1 John begins by proclaiming himself to his readers as a genuine mediator of the Johannine tradition, for only on this basis can he claim to speak authoritatively to the matter in hand. Once he has assured them of his status, however, any distinction between writer and readers is soon dropped and an exploration of the issues at stake is seen to be undertaken as a joint enterprise.

In his first four verses the epistle writer sets forth his credentials and at the same time announces the benefits which his message will bring for all who heed him. Here the use of the language of original eye-witness together with the authoritative Johannine 'we' (contrast the 'you' who appear to be the addressees) is signally in evidence. Indeed, the words almost tumble over one another in the passage:

> ὃ ἀκηκόαμεν, ὃ ἑωράκαμεν...ὃ ἐθεασάμεθα...καὶ ἑωράκαμεν καὶ μαρτυροῦμεν καὶ ἀπαγγέλλομεν ὑμῖν...ὃ ἑωράκαμεν καὶ ἀκηκόαμεν, ἀπαγγέλλομεν καὶ ὑμῖν, ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς κοινωνίαν ἔχητε μεθ' ἡμῶν...(κοινωνία) ἡμετέρα...γράφομεν ἡμεῖς...(χαρὰ) ἡμῶν...[19]

18. For a study of John and 1 John as polemical documents directed to entirely different situations, see R.A. Whitacre, *Johannine Polemic: The Role of Tradition and Theology* (SBLDS, 67; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982). Even if Jn 6.66 indicates that the evangelist himself was no stranger to schism, it can be plausibly argued that the pressure here has resulted from the threat of persecution from outside and not from internal disputes over doctrine; see C.H. Cosgrove, 'The Place where Jesus is: Allusions to Baptism and the Eucharist in the Fourth Gospel', *NTS* 35 (1989), pp. 522-39, esp. pp. 527-30. Thus, it is unlikely that Jn 6.66 and 1 Jn 2.19 are a match in cause as well as in effect (*pace* Hengel, *Question*, p. 52).

19. 'What we have heard, what we have seen...what we behold...and we have seen and we bear witness and we announce to you...what we have seen and we have heard, we announce also to you, so that you may have fellowship with us...our (fellowship)...we write...our (joy)...' There is some textual disagreement over

The author is clearly taking his stand as a true representative of the Johannine tradition. His appropriation to himself of these verbs of perception and proclamation demonstrates that 'what was from the beginning...concerning the word of life' (1.1) has remained unchanged, is therefore reliable, and will be the burden of the witness he himself is about to give.[20] His use of the 'we' here is the prerogative of the tradition bearer,[21] and in that regard is to be compared with the 'we' of apostolic authority which Paul occasionally adopts.[22] In short, the author's principal intention in this passage is to establish his undisputed access to the original, and therefore genuine and life-giving, Johannine Christian message. As a result of this the message itself is alluded to only in snatches during the course of this self-advertisement and information on it is kept to a minimum for the moment. In fact, the whole tenor of the beginning of 1 John is one of declaration of the author's authoritative status in relation to his readers, and as such his introduction is perhaps better compared with what Paul has to say about himself at the beginning of Romans rather than treated, as is often the case, as a somewhat lack-lustre version of the prologue to the Gospel.[23]

ἡμεῖς and ἡμῶν in v. 4, but the reading given here is probably to be preferred (so Brown, *Epistles*, pp. 172-73).

20. The presence of eye-witness language in a Johannine text need not imply that its author was one of the original disciples. For a discussion on a later generation's capacity to identify with the original witnesses, see Lieu, 'Authority', pp. 213-14; *eadem*, *The Second and Third Epistles of John: History and Background* (Studies of the New Testament and its World; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1986), pp. 143-44; Brown, *Epistles*, pp. 160-61.

21. Brown identifies those who use the 'we' as tradition bearers and interpreters who constitute 'the Johannine school' (*Epistles*, pp. 94-97, esp. n. 221). See also the remarks by J.-W. Taeger on the role and function of the *Traditionsträger* with reference to 1 Jn 1.1-3 in 'Der konservative Rebell: Zum Widerstand des Diotrephes gegen den Presbyter', *ZNW* 78 (1987), pp. 267-87 (284).

22. In 1 Cor. 15.11, the 'we' is used as a guarantee that the tradition conveyed by Paul beginning at v. 3 is genuine apostolic teaching. The same claim to apostolic authority applies in the case of the 'we' in 1 Cor. 11.16; see also 'we preach Christ crucified' in 1.23. For an examination of Paul's use of 'we' in 2 Corinthians, see M. Carrez, 'Le "Nous" en 2 Corinthiens', *NTS* 26 (1980), pp. 474-86; for doubts on whether the authoritative 'we' of the Johannine authors can be equated with an apostolic claim as such, see Brown, *Epistles*, pp. 94-95, 159.

23. The epistle's introduction inevitably suffers by comparison with the Gospel prologue; see, e.g., Houlden, *Epistles*, pp. 45-54; Brown, *Epistles*, pp. 179-80.

Having formally declared his pedigree, the author is now content to put aside the we/you divide between himself and his audience. From 1.5 onwards, with the authoritative proclamation that God is light, this differentiation ceases and, where necessary, now takes the more personal I/you form.[24] In effect the original 'we' has now been expanded to include the addressees themselves, and so that knowledge of tradition, properly the responsibility of a particular group within the community, is now regarded as the common property of the whole company as receivers of Johannine 'truth'.[25] From now on the author uses the 'we' to represent both himself and his readers; it will imply the shared experience as well as the shared knowledge of writer and readers alike.

As the epistle writer embarks on his main task, his intention is to teach his group in a manner which not only affords reassurance in a new and unprecedented situation but which also provides a basis for future growth. In practice his campaign is twofold: on the one hand he reminds his readers of what they (and he) already hold to be true, and on the other hand he draws out the implications of those accepted truths in order to speak to contemporary community needs. Two examples of this method should suffice to illustrate the point.

1 John 3.5-8 is part of a wider consideration of the privileged status of the τέκνα θεοῦ ('children of God'). This was begun at 3.1, where it was triggered by the mention of ἐξ αὐτοῦ γεγέννηται ('born of him') in 2.29. In 3.4 the subject of sin has been raised in this connection and

However, whether its author intended to invite such a comparison is extremely doubtful. He has not used either ἐν ἀρχῇ or πρὸς τὸν θεόν, both of which occur nowhere else in the Gospel *except* in the prologue (compare 1 Jn 3.21 where πρὸς τὸν θεόν is used but in a different context). Meanwhile, in form and/or meaning his λόγος, ἀπ' ἀρχῆς and πρὸς τὸν πατέρα are all to be found in the Gospel but *not* in the prologue (for λόγος see n. 13 above, and cf. Jn 5.24; 8.51, 52 and 6.63, 68 [with ῥήματα]; for ἀπ' ἀρχῆς and πρὸς τὸν πατέρα see respectively Jn 15.27; 5.45). As for the prologue's ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν (Jn 1.4), cf. rather 1 Jn 5.11c, and even then Jn 5.26 is closer. These examples confirm that the epistle's introduction is a thoroughly Johannine piece; what they do not confirm is that it was intended to direct the mind unerringly to Jn 1.1-18.

24. See, e.g., 2.7, 8, 12-14, 20-21, 26-27; 5.13.

25. This sense of a common cause need not be affected even when the 'we' is used on occasion to declare an adverse position. For the argument that this feature is part of the author's persuasive style of argumentation, see Lieu, 'Authority', pp. 221-22.

sin has been equated with lawlessness. The author is about to assure his readers that those who adhere to the Johannine faith are not susceptible to this kind of sin[26] and at the same time to advise them on how to identify those who are. Accordingly, in v. 5 he appeals to something they know about Jesus as a basis for the argument which will follow: καὶ οἴδατε ὅτι ἐκεῖνος ἐφανερώθη, ἵνα τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἄρῃ, καὶ ἁμαρτία ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστιν ('And you know that he appeared to take away sins, and in him there is no sin'). The ἐκεῖνος ('he') here certainly refers to Jesus, and the assumption that Jesus takes away sin is of a piece with the author's previous description of Jesus in 2.2 as the expiation (ἱλασμός) for the sins of the faithful, a statement which he had subsequently expanded at that point to include the sins of the whole world.

As the argument develops throughout vv. 6-8 the positive and negative implications of the Jesus tradition in v. 5 are neatly balanced and the whole is rounded off by a further reference to the original statement. In v. 6 we are told that remaining in Jesus guarantees sinlessness while sinful behaviour demonstrates ignorance of Jesus. After the little warning which begins v. 7, there follows an expanded and modified version of the contrast in v. 6, this time placing the emphasis firmly on behaviour. Thus, in v. 7b 'not sinning' has become 'doing righteousness' and is traced to its origin in Jesus (ἐκεῖνος again), while in v. 8a the character of the one who does sin receives a closer definition as originating with the devil, the archetypal sinner. Finally, this allows, the ἐκεῖνος ἐφανερώθη, ἵνα τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἄρῃ in v. 5 to be reworked in v. 8b as ἐφανερώθη ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα λύσῃ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ διαβόλου ('the Son of God appeared to destroy the works of the devil'). Taken as a whole this is a typical 1 John 'by their fruits ye shall know them' argument.[27] In this case, however, the argument is based on something the community already believes about Jesus.

26. This is uncompromisingly stated in 3.9, and is logical in the context of a passage which contrasts the child of God with the child of the devil. This does not prevent the author from insisting in 1.8-10 that the faithful must acknowledge that they do sin. But in this case, as with sin committed by a 'brother' in 5.16-17, matters can be put right. For 1 John the true child of God is always potentially in receipt of God's forgiveness, love and protection (1.9; 4.10; 5.18).

27. For other examples of this attitude in 1 John see 1.6; 2.4-6, 9-11, 15-17, 29; 3.12, 14; 4.8, 20.

In 1 Jn 3.16-18 we find the author in the midst of edifying his readers on how to put into practice the command to love one another. He has reminded them of this command in v. 11 and in vv. 12-15 he has told them how not to do it by citing the example of Cain, after which he has firmly dissociated their own calling from the Cain stereotype. By v. 16 he is ready to provide a positive model. Note again the appeal to something known about Jesus which he now cites as the supreme definition of loving behaviour: ἐν τούτῳ ἐγνώκαμεν τὴν ἀγάπην, ὅτι ἐκεῖνος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἔθηκεν ('By this we know love, that he laid down his life for us') (v. 16a), after which the reader is exhorted to imitate Jesus with regard to his brother in faith (v. 16b, note the stress in the καὶ ἡμεῖς ὀφείλομεν ['and we ought']). In v. 17 he gives an example of how that principle should operate in day-to-day living. He expresses it negatively by way of criticism of those who do not respond in the appropriate manner, but nevertheless the application is clear enough. The principle in v. 16a of expending one's life (τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἔθηκεν) has now become a matter of expending one's *means* of life or livelihood (βίος) so that to do this on behalf of those in need is seen as a practical expression of God's love. At v. 18 the author sums up his argument in a nutshell: the right kind of loving behaviour (i.e. ἐν ... ἀληθείᾳ) is not lip service but loving 'in action' (ἐν ἔργῳ). Thus, once again, we see the author citing a known tradition and expounding it in terms of ethical behaviour.

We are now in a position to define the character of the epistle a little more closely. In the writer we have an authoritarian figure, a member of the 'we' group who regard themselves as guardians and transmitters of original Johannine tradition. As a member of such a group, the author can legitimately reaffirm those truths shared by himself and his readers and accepted by all concerned as the group's basic principles. As he works to meet the demands of new and disturbing circumstances brought about by a recent community crisis, he not only reminds his readers of their tradition but also interprets it afresh to allow it to speak directly to their needs. Thus, as in 1 Jn 2.7-8, the 'old commandment'—the word they have heard from the beginning—can also be expressed as a 'new commandment' inasmuch as it continues to remain true. On this basis, we may take it that the epistle writer's work consists essentially of a superstructure of argument built on a foundation of shared principles, and, moreover, that these principles are what the

author understands to be basic constituents of the Johannine Christian tradition.[28]

Linking Gospel and Epistle

I have suggested that the clue to the real nature of the link between John and 1 John, and hence to the bearing which the epistle can have on the matter of isolating tradition in the Gospel, lies in understanding the epistle writer's methods. For if we think that in thus confining our attention to the epistle we have by now travelled far from the world of the evangelist, a moment's consideration will tell us that indeed we have not. The fact is that our chief impression of the Gospel is often influenced by the features which strike us most, in particular perhaps the magnificent prologue and the magisterial 'I am' statements on the lips of the Johannine Jesus. Yet we must not allow our enthusiasm for such artistry to obscure the fact that the real points of correspondence with 1 John are also embedded in the Gospel text. These are the presence of the Johannine 'we' in conjunction with eye-witness language, and certain statements which correspond with the content of what 1 John had appealed to as original tradition.

The evangelist uses the 'we' to speak on behalf of the faithful community in the prologue. It appears with an eye-witness verb in 1.14b, 'we have beheld [ἐθεασάμεθα] his glory' (cf. ὃ ἐθεασάμεθα in 1 Jn 1.1), and in v. 16 it is used where the faithful (ἡμεῖς πάντες) are described as recipients of grace. Note also that in v. 14a the evangelist says that the Word dwelt 'among us' (ἐν ἡμῖν), a phrase which finds its parallel in 1 Jn 4.9, 16. It is also worth observing in this context that the 'we' appears again right at the end of the Gospel where the veracity of the beloved disciple's witness is guaranteed (21.24). Although this verse is not usually attributed to the evangelist, in the light of his use of the 'we' elsewhere it is surely a possibility that he himself has also penned this final comment.[29]

28. See further O.A. Piper's excellent defence of the case for treating 1 John as a piece based on known tradition in '1 John and the Didache of the Primitive Church', *JBL* 66 (1947), pp. 437-51.

29. Among those who identify the 'we' in 21.24 as the evangelist's trademark as in the prologue are P.S. Minear ('The Original Functions of John 21', *JBL* 102 [1983], pp. 85-98, esp. p. 95) and P.F. Ellis (*The Genius of John* [Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1984], p. 308). The reappearance of the 'we' here fits in well with customary devices for framing a narrative (see Culpepper, *Anatomy*, p. 46), and the

We can also extend this comparison with the epistle by including the 'you' of direct address to the readers. In 20.31, a passage remarkably similar to 1 Jn 5.13, the evangelist turns aside from his narrative to tell his readers that he writes 'that you may believe' (ἵνα πιστεύ[σ]ητε)[30] and 'that believing you may have life' (ἵνα πιστεύοντες ζωὴν ἔχητε). We may also choose to add here the little aside to the readers ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς πιστεύ[σ]ητε ('that you also may believe') in 19.35, assuming, of course, that that is also original to John.[31]

For the rest of the time the evangelist does not speak directly to his readers nor represent them in person, and in that regard his work differs from that of the epistle writer. But the difference is only a matter of genre. A Gospel is, ostensibly at least, a narrative of the life of Jesus in times past, and hence its author will tend throughout to assume the low profile of disinterested narrator. It follows that the Gospel medium is a form of communication between writer and readers which is primarily indirect. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that the instances where the 'we' and 'you' are used directly in the Gospel occur largely outside the 'time capsule' of the narrative itself. However, this does not mean that the indirect form of communication cannot be effective, nor should we take it that the evangelist has ceased his policy of representing and instructing his community once the narration has begun.

We may be certain that the evangelist's readers would have identified readily with the faithful in the Gospel story. With this in mind we must surely take careful note of where the 'we' occurs on the lips of the faithful as the narrative proceeds, for this is probably the Johannine 'we' thinly disguised and as such is likely to introduce some known and commonly accepted formula. By the same token, those occasions where the Johannine Jesus addresses his ἴδιοι as 'you' should not be

sentence 'we know that his testimony is true' looks like a typical Johannine endorsement formula which the evangelist could well have used. J. Chapman points to the parallels in 19.35 and 3 Jn 12 ('We Know that his Testimony is True', *JTS* 31 [1930], pp. 379-87, esp. pp. 380-81) but has overlooked Jn 5.32, which is closer to 21.24 than 19.35, and is indisputably attributed to John himself.

30. The present of πιστεύειν, which implies the continuation and strengthening of faith, is probably to be preferred here to the aorist which would be appropriate to conversion to faith (see Barrett, *Gospel*, p. 575).

31. Beasley-Murray recognizes a 'growing consensus' of opinion among scholars that 19.35 is inauthentic because of its verbal links with 21.24 (*John*, p. 354). This relies far too heavily on the unquestioned assumption that 21.24 was not written by the evangelist.

ignored, for these will be the points where the evangelist offers advice and instruction to his readers.

While the 'we' occurs naturally as part of the inevitable Gospel dialogue, there are occasions where it is used with the language of witness in a way evidently intended to resound beyond the confines of the historical setting. For example, in 4.42 we read that the Samaritan villagers have heard (ἀκηκόαμεν) for themselves and now know (οἴδαμεν) that 'this is truly the Saviour of the world'. There is also the confession of Peter in 6.69 who, as spokesman for the disciples, affirms that they have believed and have come to know (ἡμεῖς πεπιστεύκαμεν καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν) that Jesus is the Holy One of God. Furthermore, in view of the presence of eye-witness language, it may be feasible also to include in this category one of the instances where Jesus himself speakes in terms of 'we'. John 3.11 begins with an address specifically to Nicodemus (ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω σοι) but in what follows the personal pronouns change abruptly to the plural, and this has the effect of raising what is said to the level of a general comment.[32] Note how close the ὃ ἑωράκαμεν μαρτυροῦμεν here comes to the καὶ ἑωράκαμεν καὶ μαρτυροῦμεν in 1 Jn 1.2.[33] Thus, the 'we' here is probably to be regarded as introducing an attitude of the Johannine faithful. The conviction that their witness is not received is certainly not untypical of the author's own stance in the prologue and elsewhere.[34]

While Jesus does address his disciples as 'you' earlier in the Gospel,[35] this feature is signally in evidence in the last discourse material where Jesus instructs them privately and at length (chapters 13–16). The tone of assurance in these passages is quite marked, and the object seems to be not only to ensure community survival beyond the recent trauma of rejection by Judaism but also to provide a basis for the community's continuing growth and development into the future.[36] Indeed, not only

32. See also v. 12 where the second person plural persists.

33. Compare also ἡμεῖς τεθεάμεθα καὶ μαρτυροῦμεν in 1 Jn 4.14.

34. See Jn 1.11 and cf. both 1.11 and 1.12 with 3.11 and 3.32-33. See also 12.37-40 where this attitude is underpinned by two texts from Isaiah. Presumably this thinking is also behind the epistle writer's assumption that the world will listen only to false prophets (1 Jn 4.5).

35. Note, e.g., the sudden shift in address from singular to plural at 1.51.

36. For the general tone of comfort and assurance, see, e.g., 14.1, 3, 18, 27; 16.33. Note also how the subject of persecution is tackled here in a way designed to encourage fortitude and to ward off dismay at its onset (15.18–16.4).

in tone but also in actual content, this relatively narrative-free area of the Gospel approximates most closely to 1 John.[37]

On this evidence we may assume that the first point of correspondence between Gospel and epistle is confirmed. It seems that the evangelist has also felt free to adopt the language of guarantee with which 1 John had defended his position as guardian and transmitter of original tradition. He has used the Johannine 'we' to represent his readers, he has also addressed them as 'you' and, as with 1 John, he has taken pains to encourage and instruct them. Moreover, he has pursued this policy not only directly but also indirectly by working through the Gospel medium. Both authors, it would seem, are tradition bearers who can address the community and put its case in the interests of providing a blueprint for the future against a background of recent crisis.

I now turn to examine the second point, namely, that the two texts coincide specifically in the terms of the tradition which the epistle writer has appealed to as the basis for his argument. With that in mind we must return to the two examples from the epistle given earlier in order to remind ourselves of the content of the traditional material cited by 1 John and to draw comparisons with relevant texts from the Gospel.

In 1 Jn 3.5 the author referred to his readers' knowledge (καὶ οἴδατε) that Jesus was manifested 'to take away sins' (ἵνα τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἄρῃ). I suggested that this bore on a previous statement in 2.2 where Jesus was described as the expiation not only for the sins of the faithful but also for the sins of the whole world (περὶ ὅλου του κόσμου). If we take the ἵνα τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἄρῃ of 3.5 together with the reference to ὁ κόσμος in 2.2, we come up with something remarkably similar to the declaration of John the Baptist in Jn 1.29 that Jesus, the Lamb of God, 'takes away the sin of the world' (ὁ αἴρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν του κόσμου). Thus, we have good reason to assume that this part of Jn 1.29 was not newly minted by the evangelist when he wrote but that at this point he was repeating the essential elements of a statement of a confessional nature about Jesus which was already part of the Johannine Christian tradition. Moreover, judging by the way it has been reflected

37. As in 1 John note the use of the affectionate τεκνία (13.33), the emphasis on the love command (13.34; 15.12), the theme of possession of the Spirit (14.16, 17, 26; 15.26; 16.7-15), the expectation of joy fulfilled (15.11; 16.20, 22, 24) and the assurance that prayer will be answered (14.13-14; 15.7, 16; 16.23, 24). For a chart of themes common to 1 John and the final discourses, see S.S. Smalley, *1, 2, 3, John* (WBC, 51; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1984), p. xxx.

with only minor variation in both writings, it would seem that the verbal form of this statement has been fairly fixed. There are other indications in both texts which would support such a conclusion. For example, it is worth noting that, while both authors faithfully retail this information, neither consistently makes full use of the entire content of what he reports. Thus, in the Gospel the atoning quality of Jesus' death is not denied but at the same time it is not a major theme, while in the epistle the sense of outreach to the world is almost wholly absent and hence the writer's reference to ὁ κόσμος in 2.2 is untypically benevolent for him.[38] It is also significant that neither author puts αἴρειν together with ἁμαρτία in any other context—indeed in 1 John αἴρειν never occurs outside 3.5 where this tradition is cited. Finally, it is also relevant to observe that outside these two references αἴρειν and ἁμαρτία are never found together anywhere else in the New Testament.

In 1 Jn 3.16 the model behaviour of Jesus (ὅτι ἐκεῖνος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἔθηκεν) is cited as the starting point of a brief treatment of the nature of loving in action. The most prominent Gospel reference to this is as a laudable principle placed on Jesus' lips at 15.13 where, as in 1 John, it not only connects with the love command but serves as a definition of loving in action. Indeed, *mutatis mutandis* the two texts are very similar:

> ἐν τούτῳ ἐγνώκαμεν τὴν ἀγάπην,
> ὅτι ἐκεῖνος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἔθηκεν (1 Jn 3.16).
>
> μείζονα ταύτης ἀγάπην οὐδεὶς ἔχει,
> ἵνα τις τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ θῇ ὑπὲρ τῶν φίλων αὐτοῦ
> (cf. v. 14a, ὑμεῖς φίλοι μού ἐστε) (Jn 15.13).[39]

38. See especially Lieu's remark that 1 John's references to the world in 2.2 and 4.14 'sound like statements which have survived in tradition and they have no effect on the theology of the immediate context or of the Epistle as a whole' (*Second and Third Epistles*, p. 183). We have already seen good reason to identify the title σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου in 4.14 as tradition because of the 'we' and the eye-witness language which herald it in Jn 4.42.

39. 'By this we know love,
that he laid down his life for us' (1 Jn 3.16).

'No one has greater love than this,
to lay down one's life for one's friends' (cf. v. 14a, 'You are my friends') (Jn 15.13).

The Gospel makes other references to this principle of laying down life. For example, it is present in ch. 10 where it is applied to Jesus as the Good Shepherd who lays down his life for the sheep:

ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ τίθησιν ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων (10.11)
τὴν ψυχήν μου τίθημι ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων (10.15)
ἐγὼ τίθημι τὴν ψυχήν μου (10.17)
ἐγὼ τίθημι αὐτὴν...θεῖναι αὐτήν (10.18).[40]

It also appears in 13.37, again in the context of the love command (vv. 34, 35), where it supplies the verbal form of Peter's foolhardy declaration of loyalty to Jesus, and in v. 38 Jesus echoes these words in querying Peter's competence to perform the act:

τὴν ψυχήν μου ὑπὲρ σοῦ θήσω (13.37)
τὴν ψυχήν σου ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ θήσεις (13.38).[41]

Here again we are almost certainly in touch with an element of Johannine Christian tradition which has been picked up by both authors and differently applied. Again we have language peculiar to the group (τίθημι ψυχήν is uniquely Johannine)[42] in which they expressed their belief that Jesus had loved them by sacrificing his life on their behalf.

On this evidence it seems that our second point of correspondence can also be confirmed. In the two examples from 1 John where it was possible to detect that the epistle writer was appealing to tradition, the close verbal correspondence with the Gospel has emerged precisely in the content of the tradition cited and *not* in the surrounding argument.

40. 'The good shepherd lays down his life for the sheep' (10.11)
'I lay down my life for the sheep' (10.15)
'I lay down my life' (10.17)
'I lay it down...to lay it down' (10.18).

41. 'I will lay down my life for you' (13.37)
'Will you lay down your life for me?' (13.38).

Note also the formal similarity between these examples and the dictum of Caiaphas ἵνα εἷς ἄνθρωπος ἀποθάνῃ ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ in 11.50. The application of this 'prophecy' to the τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ in 11.52 certainly implies that it is intended to bear the same meaning. On the influence of the Good Shepherd material on this passage, see C.H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953), p. 368; J. Beutler, 'Two Ways of Gathering: The Plot to Kill Jesus in John 11.47-53', *NTS* 40 (1994), pp. 399-406 (403).

42. So Ruckstuhl, *Einheit* (1987), p. 298.

We may also pause to reflect that, since in these two cases the tradition in question has been expressed in an idiom distinctive to the Johannine writings, then it could not immediately have been discerned by adducing Synoptic or Pauline parallels.

I have attempted to achieve a more precise understanding of the relation between John and 1 John by concentrating first on the epistle writer and his methods, and it seems that this approach has served us well. In 1 John we have seen a tradition bearer at work seeking to reassure his community in the wake of a crisis by citing known tradition and interpreting it to meet their needs. In the Gospel we have seen another tradition bearer at work similarly bent on reassurance, and on his own showing already known to us as a receiver and highly creative interpreter of tradition. Further comparisons have shown that material which the author of 1 John had appealed to as the basis of his argument may be recognized in the evangelist's text also. In other words, what the epistle writer identifies as original tradition the Gospel also contains.

In view of these and our earlier findings it seems feasible to describe John and 1 John in the following terms. We are dealing with two documents which belong to different literary types and which have been addressed to the Johannine church at different stages in its fortunes. Thus, in terms of genre and orientation to particular circumstances, they are not alike. Nevertheless, they can be compared in certain fundamental respects as follows: in both cases the author responsible has had access to community tradition, and in both cases the procedure of citing tradition and interpreting it to meet present needs has been adopted. These common features have given rise to a third point of comparison and, in this case, a phenomenon which has, in effect, forged the link between John and 1 John as they are now known to us in their final form. This is the fact that there have been occasions when Gospel and epistle have coincided in reflecting tradition with the same content.

Thus, a picture emerges of John and 1 John as independent productions, which relate to one another by virtue of their mutual reliance on a body of tradition which was known to both authors and to their readers before either document was written. Moreover, it is a picture which makes sense of the results of my earlier attempts to compare them directly. It plausibly explains the pattern of striking but intermittent contact between them that we observed at that point, for it allows us to

understand how material traceable directly from one text to another can be found in contexts where no such correspondence exists.

It hardly needs to be stressed that this perspective on John and 1 John does not accord with the majority view that the epistle is directly related to the Gospel and was intended as some kind of explanatory adjunct to it.[43] But there again we have seen no evidence to suggest that this was so. Neither 1 John's declaration of his status as tradition bearer nor the terms in which he has couched his message have conveyed any impression that he has needed to defer to the work of a predecessor to make his case. More specifically, it seems that the verbal parallels which exist between Gospel and epistle cannot be claimed as evidence that the epistolary author was referring directly to the Gospel itself. On the contrary, these are best described as instances of tradition overlap: they are points where the author of 1 John has repeated certain elements in the tradition ἀπ' ἀρχῆς which the evangelist, writing in another context, had also known and reproduced. In sum, the findings indicate that what links the epistle materially to the Gospel is the Johannine Christian tradition, or at least certain important aspects of it.

Conclusions

Having thus specified the nature of what is common to John and 1 John I have at the same time supplied the evidence in favour of my initial proposal that the epistle could be made to function as a control to isolate tradition in the text of the Gospel. On this basis we may assume that where the epistle writer reminds his readers of what they 'know', or speaks of what they have 'heard from the beginning', or simply takes for granted a particular attitude, and where the equivalent (or near equivalent) occurs in the Gospel, then at such points the evangelist has included known community tradition as part of his text. We will then be in a position to judge how the evangelist himself has chosen to build on this material in the process of composing the Gospel. To this extent, then, 1 John is surely qualified to take its place alongside other means

43. There are, however, dissenting voices. See, e.g., G. Strecker, 'Die Anfänge der johanneischen Schule', *NTS* 32 (1986), pp. 31-47, esp. pp. 40-41, and Lieu, *Theology*, esp. p. 101. Both scholars have also found reason to regard the epistle as an independent piece which reflects community tradition. Even Raymond Brown does not exclude this position as a possible alternative to his own thesis (see *Epistles*, p. 86 n. 190).

of identifying the tradition known to the fourth evangelist, and therefore it remains only to add some brief remarks on the potential value of the epistle's contribution in this regard.

As with our other resources, the epistle offers only a limited insight into what the evangelist knew. It cannot help us in terms of narrative, nor will it teach us anything radically new about the essentials of Johannine faith compared with what we could reasonably have guessed from passages elsewhere in the New Testament which express the same Christian sentiments.[44] Nevertheless, in one important respect the epistle's contribution is of outstanding value, because at the level of *diction* 1 John as a control is unsurpassed. In other words, given that the epistle is another Johannine piece, then in this instance we have a control in which the tradition is articulated using the distinctive style and vocabulary with which the evangelist himself was familiar. This means that in those areas where 1 John does come into play we can be clearer than otherwise would be possible about the precise wording of the tradition the evangelist knew, and hence can more easily discern its presence in his text. With this in mind, it is worth remembering that 1 Jn 4.9-10 offers the closest available parallel to Jn 3.16-17 in which the 'Johannine kerygma' is thought to be represented.[45] As I hinted in my opening paragraph, this seems to have helped to provide the conceptual framework for John's distinctive presentation of Jesus. Among other examples we may note that the Johannine version of the 'ask, and it will be given' logion is common to both,[46] as is also a jaundiced outlook on

44. For example, Jn 1.29/1 Jn 2.2; 3.5 can be compared with 2 Cor. 5.19 and 1 Tim. 1.15, both of which are also assumed to reflect traditional formulae; for Jn 15.13 etc./1 Jn 3.16 cf. esp. Gal. 2.20; Eph. 5.2 and the Son of man logion in Mk 10.45 (cf. 1 Tim. 2.5-6). This agreement over fundamentals is hardly surprising; it simply confirms that the Johannine group was a branch of the early Christian tree and not an alien life form.

45. As is often remarked, the benefits of the mission of the Son in the 1 John passage are confined to the believing community and do not extend to the world. However, this particularization looks like a deliberate modification. 1 Jn 4.14 shows that the author is fully aware of the universal scope of the divine intention (cf. Jn 3.17; 4.42). Note, significantly, that this is precisely the point where the language of original eye-witness makes its appearance in his argument.

46. For the full range of references to this well-attested logion together with a proposal that it is an item of early tradition which was probably original to Jesus, see D. Goldsmith, ' "Ask, and it will be Given...": Toward Writing the History of a Logion', *NTS* 35 (1989), pp. 254-65.

the world as the sphere of inevitable opposition and hatred towards the faithful.[47] In short, this is the stuff of which the fourth Gospel was made, and which was no less influential in the evangelist's thinking than other aspects of the early Christian tradition on which he drew.

Putting Theory into Practice

In this chapter I have attempted to demonstrate that John and 1 John relate to one another indirectly by virtue of their common reliance on community tradition. I have also claimed that this state of affairs can be turned to advantage in that 1 John can prove an additional and valuable means of isolating tradition in the evangelist's text, thereby significantly improving our chances of understanding the creative processes which gave shape to the finished piece. It is now time to put this claim to the test. Theoretically, of course, there is nothing to prevent me from analysing the entire Gospel from this perspective. However, such an undertaking would be immense and could well find me casting about for hyperbole on the scale of Jn 21.25! Accordingly, my aspirations will be more modest and I will confine my attention to a single, sustained piece of composition. In the interests of ensuring that the test is of the stiffest, I propose to attempt an analysis of what is arguably the finest, most complex and, from a historical-critical standpoint, the most infuriatingly inscrutable piece of work that ever came from John's pen. I refer, of course, to his account of the raising of Lazarus. As I will make clear as I proceed, I am in agreement with the view that the Lazarus story was not originally part of the Gospel but was carefully edited in to it by John at a later stage. I will also maintain that this story was part of a second edition of the Gospel which John undertook in response to a community situation of deepening crisis. I shall now embark on the first of three separate studies on aspects of John's narrative in 11.1-44 where 1 John has a contribution to make.

47. The world's hatred is introduced in Jn 15.18-19 and 1 Jn 3.13 as an accepted fact of life whose abiding relevance is merely confirmed by present difficulties (see also Jn 7.7; 17.14). Barnabas Lindars describes this attitude as a Johannine 'maxim' which in this case has its roots in traditional Jesus logia; see Lindars, 'The Persecution of Christians in Jn. 15.18–16.4a', in Tuckett (ed.), *Essays*, pp. 131-52 (141).

Chapter 2

JESUS' LOVE FOR LAZARUS

The first two verses of John's raising story are devoted to introducing the ailing Lazarus to his readers as the brother of the Bethany sisters, Mary and Martha. These formalities completed, John quickly moves on to events in v. 3 with the sisters' delicately expressed appeal to Jesus for help.[1] Even at this early stage, however, John's narrative begins to disclose his special interests. It is important to notice how the message to Jesus has been phrased, for in it Lazarus is not named but simply described as ὃν φιλεῖς ('he whom you love'). Already, then, there has been a shift in emphasis: what matters now is not who Lazarus is as much as how he stands in relation to Jesus; Lazarus is someone whom Jesus loves. Why has John sought to introduce this new slant on the situation? One possible option is that we are to understand simply that Jesus has a natural human affection for Lazarus. This view is not without its advocates[2] and, on the face of it, seems plausible enough, especially given John's own emphasis on Jesus' love for the family as a whole in v. 5. Looking further ahead, this same affection for Lazarus could be the reason why Jesus responds with such powerful emotion to the sight of Mary and 'the Jews' grieving over Lazarus' untimely death in vv. 33-35. At least, as far as 'the Jews' are concerned, this is a

1. Note a similar delicacy in the oblique request John attributes to Jesus' mother in 2.3. For this comparison, see esp. E.C. Hoskyns, *The Fourth Gospel* (ed. F.N. Davey; London: Faber & Faber, 2nd edn, 1947), p. 399; Barrett, *Gospel*, p. 390; J. Ponthot, 'La methode historico-critique en exégèse: Application à Jean 11', in A.-L. Descamps *et al.*, *Genèse et structure d'un texte du Nouveau Testament: Etude interdisciplinaire du chapitre 11 de l'évangile de Jean* (LD, 104; Paris: Cerf; Louvain-la-Neuve: Cabay, 1981), pp. 81-105 (95).

2. For example, Rudolf Bultmann's comment on John's use of φιλεῖν and ἀγαπᾶν in this story is that 'the verbs do not have a specific Johannine meaning here, but denote the human relationship' (*The Gospel of John: A Commentary* [G.R. Beasley-Murray; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971], p. 397 n. 2).

satisfactory explanation of Jesus' own grief at this point. Their comment, ἴδε πῶς ἐφίλει αὐτόν (v. 36), which recalls the contents of the message in v. 3, indicates as much. Yet the very fact that John has attributed this remark to 'the Jews' should be enough to warn us against a too superficial interpretation of its meaning. After all, since when did the opinion of 'the Jews' in this Gospel adequately reflect the evangelist's real intentions? Even when sympathetic towards Jesus, as is the case here, their keen grasp of the obvious usually acts as a foil to the deeper truths John intends his readers to understand.[3] No, if John wants us to know that Jesus loves Lazarus and is prepared, unusually, to show Jesus in inner turmoil in that connection, then he has something more than natural human friendship in mind. Our first step towards a better understanding of his thinking will be to seek the guidance of 1 John on the tradition John had available to him.

Love in the Johannine Tradition

1 John has much to say to his readers about love. Writing against a background of schism within the community, he is at pains to assure those who have remained loyal that theirs is a genuine Christian faith. One consistent ploy is to emphasize how they conduct themselves in their daily lives: true faith, he argues, is a matter of keeping the commandments and living as Jesus lived.[4] The love command is central to his thesis. Time and again he refers to it, attributing it to Jesus himself (3.23),[5] and insisting that this be the governing principle in all contact between believers, for only in loving conduct towards others is the true child of God to be identified (cf. 3.10; 4.7-12, etc.). It is in our interest to note that he expects his readers to be thoroughly familiar with the love command: it is not new to them, he says, but is an old com-

3. See, e.g., Jn 2.20; 3.4 (Nicodemus); 6.42, 52; 7.35; 8.22. The function of 'the Jews' in the Lazarus story will be discussed in Chapter 5.

4. See, e.g., 1 Jn 2.3-6, 8; 3.3, 7, 22-24; 4.17; 5.2-3.

5. I am assuming that the weight of Gospel tradition tells in favour of the 'he' in 1 Jn 3.23c as a reference to Jesus (cf. v. 23b) rather than to God. See esp. the Johannine version of the commandment in Jn 13.34; 15.12, 17, which tradition 1 John evidently knows (cf. 1 Jn 2.7-8). Nevertheless, this identification is not clear from the general thrust of the argument in 3.19-24. See further the discussion in Brown, *Epistles*, p. 464. Brown opts for a reference to God, as does Lieu (*Theology*, p. 55).

mandment,[6] something belonging to the Johannine Christian tradition as it was first preached to them (2.7; 3.11).[7] Now as a rule, our author is content simply to refer to the commandment itself rather than getting down to brass tacks on what one should actually do to fulfil it. On one occasion, however, he does become very specific on that score, and here we need to observe his methods closely. It is clear from 3.17-18 that he thinks love put into practice should result in placing one's worldly means at the service of a brother in need. More to the point for our purposes, however, is the fact that he has extrapolated that teaching from something known about Jesus in the tradition. The crucial text is 3.16a: ἐν τούτῳ ἐγνώκαμεν τὴν ἀγάπην, ὅτι ἐκεῖνος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἔθηκεν; they all know what love involves, he says, from the fact that Jesus laid down his life on their behalf.[8] He then applies what Jesus did for them to what they must do for one another (v. 16b), and hence on to the nitty-gritty example in the next verse.

As I argued in Chapter 1, we can tell from the equivalent wording in the Gospel that the evangelist has also had access to this same traditional material and, as is his custom, will have used it as the basis for his own creative composition. In the Gospel, we see Jesus actually give the love command three times (13.34; 15.12, 17) and refer several times to laying down life for others. Out of these references, the key text is undoubtedly Jn 15.13: μείζονα ταύτης ἀγάπην οὐδεὶς ἔχει, ἵνα τις τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ θῇ ὑπὲρ τῶν φίλων αὐτοῦ ('No one has greater love than this, to lay down one's life for one's friends'). This verse most nearly resembles 1 Jn 3.16 in format (see above) and,

6. 1 John's insistence that the commandment is παλαιά as well as καινή does not constitute a departure from the evangelist's position. Rather, the difference is merely a matter of genre. To judge from Jn 13.34; 1 Jn 2.7-8, it appears that both writers knew the love command as Jesus' 'new' commandment. Accordingly, the evangelist presents it as such in the Gospel story, while 1 John makes play with this known concept for the edification of his readers. In the case of the evangelist's own readers, of course, it will also have been an 'old' commandment ἀπ' ἀρχῆς. 1 John's reference to its antiquity, therefore, does not constitute grounds for supposing that the epistle was written later than the Gospel, *pace* Whitacre, *Johannine Polemic*, p. 3; Lieu, *Second and Third Epistles*, pp. 74-75.

7. 1 John's ἀπ' ἀρχῆς here probably has a double reference both to the origin of the tradition with Jesus and to the Johannine Christians' first acquaintance with it on conversion; see Brown, *Epistles*, p. 265.

8. The ὅτι here is epexegetical of the ἐν τούτῳ phrase and introduces something factual (see Brown, *Epistles*, p. 448).

significantly, it occurs in the midst of Jesus' private instruction to the disciples about their future. Even more explicitly than in 1 John, laying down life is linked with the love command (v. 12) and, as in the epistle, is seen as the ultimate definition of what love means when put into practice.

Thus, by taking our cue from 1 John, we have established that Gospel references to the love command and to laying down life derive from the tradition the evangelist knew. We can therefore expect his own composition to have been inspired and informed by this material. Before we return to the Gospel, however, it will be in our interest to pursue our present course a little further. We have already observed that 1 John not only cites tradition known to the evangelist but that, in the case of 3.16-18, he also applies and interprets it. The fact that he does this is to our advantage. It means that we can also profitably take 1 John's exegesis of this tradition as a guide to the evangelist's own approach. As we shall see, our authors are not always of a common mind when it comes to the realm of interpretation. In this case, then, we will seek to enhance our understanding of the evangelist by a process of comparison and contrast with what 1 John has to say.

Let us begin with 1 Jn 3.16. Speaking in the context of fulfilling the love command (v. 11), the epistle writer makes two points in this verse: first, he confidently claims that Jesus laid down his life ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν (v. 16a); and, second, he insists on that basis that Jesus' action be the model for conduct between believers (v. 16b). By adjusting to the difference in genre, it is possible to tell that both aspects of 1 John's message are also conveyed by the evangelist to his own readers in Jesus' instruction to the disciples. The relevant passage is Jn 15.12-14, part of a pericope which is bounded by references to the love command (vv. 12, 17). Note how quickly Jesus' reference to someone (τις) laying down his life for his friends in v. 13 is turned into a self-portrait: his next words to the disciples, ὑμεῖς φίλοι μού ἐστε ('You are my friends') (v. 14a), immediately confirm that Jesus has just described himself in relation to those who believe in him. Note also how Jesus teaches the disciples not only to love one another but to do so καθὼς ἠγάπησα ὑμᾶς ('as I have loved you') in v. 12. The teaching itself does not break fresh ground as far as the Gospel reader is concerned: it is essentially a repeat of Jesus' 'new' commandment as given in 13.34. However, on this occasion the command is followed immediately by the detail in v. 13 describing what Jesus himself will do for love of his

φίλοι, and this functions to specify precisely what loving one another in imitation of Jesus involves.

Thus, by comparing these texts and allowing for the Gospel medium, it becomes possible to show that the evangelist, like 1 John, intends his readers to understand that fulfilling the love command is a matter of being mindful of what Jesus did for them, and of acting accordingly in their own lives. So far, then, John and 1 John can be said to agree. However, as I have indicated, they do also differ in their interpretation of this material. It is important for our appreciation of John's work to note precisely what this difference is, and to consider the implications of the attitude he himself adopts.

Where John and 1 John part company is over the issue of how this obligation to lay down one's life in imitation of Jesus is actually to be put into practice in the daily life of the Johannine Christian. As we have seen in Chapter 1, 1 John construes this metaphorically: what is needful, he teaches, is to expend one's means of life to alleviate the deprivation of one's brother (3.17). Now there is nothing in the Gospel to suggest that the evangelist has also adopted this approach; on the contrary, in all available references, laying down life is consistently taken in its completely literal sense. To a certain extent, of course, this emphasis is inevitable given the Gospel's natural focus on Jesus himself. John's references to laying down life are largely taken up with Jesus describing his own career in these terms (10.11, 15, 17-18; 15.13), and in such instances a non-literal interpretation of his words is patently out of the question. Nevertheless, the important fact remains that when this language is not restricted to Jesus but is applied also to the *disciples* in the Gospel story, John has evidently retained its literal meaning. There are two notable examples of this, both of which occur in parts of the Gospel usually identified as belonging to a late stage in its development. In what follows, I will assume that this is so. I will also assume that the evangelist himself was responsible for the additional material.[9]

9. The disruption of the narrative from 14.31 to 18.1 is a clear indicator that chs. 15–17 are a later intrusion into the text. Similarly, the concluding remarks in 20.30-31 point to chapter 21 as an addition to the original Gospel (*pace* Minear, 'Original Functions', pp. 91-98, who argues that the additional chapter was planned from the start). For a survey of the various redaction theories, see R.E. Brown, *The Community of the Beloved Disciple* (London: Chapman, 1979), pp. 171-82; R. Kysar, *The Fourth Evangelist and his Gospel: An Examination of Contemporary*

For the first example we return to the pericope, 15.12-17. As already noted, John begins by repeating the love command from 13.34 (v. 12) but in this case follows it immediately with a second citation from tradition which specifies what Jesus himself did for love of his own (v. 13). Thus, while this tradition undoubtedly applies to Jesus in the first instance (v. 14a), the exhortation to love one another καθὼς ἠγάπησα ὑμᾶς in v. 12 signifies that it also applies to those who follow him. So far, the evangelist has kept pace with the sentiments in 1 Jn 3.16. However, this is where the resemblance ends. Search as we might in the remainder of the pericope for something along the lines of 1 Jn 3.17, the evangelist does not oblige. A non-literal interpretation of the Christian duty to lay down one's life in imitation of Jesus is simply not entertained here. Instead, the teaching which leads to the repeat of the love command (v. 17) is full of encouragement and promise, concentrating wholly on the rewards and privileges of those who are Jesus' φίλοι, that is, those who do what Jesus commands (v. 14b).

The second example is rather more complex. In this case, the essential elements are already present in chapter 13 but their full implication is not drawn out until chapter 21. In 13.34, the love command makes its appearance in the Gospel for the first time and in this context (cf. v. 35b) John's story moves towards Jesus' prediction that Peter will deny him (v. 38b). In the process, attention is focused on Peter himself. Peter is unable to understand why he cannot follow Jesus immediately (vv. 36-37a) and he protests his loyalty to Jesus by vowing τὴν ψυχήν μου ὑπὲρ σοῦ θήσω ('I will lay down my life for you') (v. 37b). These words are a deliberate reminder of Jesus' self-portrait as the Good Shepherd who lays down his life for the sheep in chapter 10 (vv. 11, 15),

Scholarship (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1975), pp. 39-54; J. Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), pp. 82-86, also pp. 199-204 on the Gospel's first edition. For a recent survey of scholarship on chapter 21, including the interesting suggestion that chapters 20 and 21 are dual endings to the Gospel, see B.R. Gaventa, 'The Archive of Excess: John 21 and the Problem of Narrative Closure', in R.A. Culpepper and C.C. Black (eds.), *Exploring the Gospel of John* (Festschrift D. Moody Smith; Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1996), pp. 240-52. On the question of the authorship of these additions, I have no objection in principle to the idea of a redactor who was not the evangelist. Nevertheless, I am so far not persuaded by the style and character of the material that such was the case. See further, my comments in Chapter 1 n. 30 and Chapter 3 n. 97. Broadly speaking, I am in agreement with Lindars's position on these issues (conveniently set out in *John*, pp. 38-39).

and by this means John implies that Peter thinks he can imitate Jesus. Jesus' stinging rejoinder, τὴν ψυχήν σου ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ θήσεις; ('Will you lay down your life for me?') (v. 38), is a mirror image of Peter's vow. This at once emphasizes Peter's aspirations and deepens the irony of the situation for, as Jesus now points out, Peter will not remain loyal to him. Nothing more is said here to clarify in what sense Peter's words in v. 37b are intended to be understood. However, this passage is certainly the backdrop for the later scene in 21.15-19 where Peter encounters the risen Lord and the dialogue between them centres on love and its implications. Peter's three affirmations of love for Jesus in vv. 15-17 are the counterpart of his earlier denials as predicted in 13.38 (cf. 18.15-27). His thrice-repeated commission is couched in pastoral imagery reminiscent of the Good Shepherd material in chapter 10 which has already been alluded to in 13.37-38. As Jesus promised in 13.36, Peter can now follow him (21.9; cf. v. 22). Precisely what this will eventually entail is supplied in Jesus' prediction of Peter's death in v. 18. The language of Peter's earlier vow does not figure here but the message in the evangelist's aside in v. 19a is unmistakable: Peter will achieve his ambition to imitate Jesus (cf. 12.33; 18.32; esp. 13.31) by laying down his life, and literally so.

Thus, when it comes to interpreting what it means in practice to lay down one's life in imitation of Jesus, the difference in attitude between John and 1 John could not be more marked. For the epistle writer, this obligation translates into a question of ethics; as the evangelist construes it, however, it requires that one's very flesh and blood be forfeit.[10] I suggest that the evangelist's literal application of this element from tradition, here thrown into sharp relief by contrast with 1 John, has important consequences for our study of the Gospel text. In particular, this evidence lends powerful support to the view that Gospel and epistle were addressed to the community under entirely different circumstances. Precisely what those circumstances were in the epistle writer's case is, of course, notoriously difficult to determine. Nevertheless, the

10. I am indebted to Professor Max Wilcox for directing me to the interpretation of Deut. 6.5 in the Mishnah (*m. Ber.* 9.5), where it is understood that to love God with the heart is to do so with the good and evil impulses, to love God with the soul is to do so with one's life, and to love God with one's might is to do so with one's wealth. Wilcox suggests that in these two apparently conflicting presentations of what love is about, we have in fact two complementary aspects of what it means to love God according to the *Shema'* as expressed in terms of love of one's fellow.

fact that he can afford to interpret laying down life metaphorically demonstrates at least that a danger to life and limb was not part of the problem; indeed, the teaching in 1 Jn 3.17 is typical of the author's concern with ethical issues throughout the letter. What we have seen of the evangelist's approach, however, enables us to pinpoint his circumstances rather more accurately. If imitating what Jesus did literally is highly recommended in chapter 15 and, indeed, is almost celebrated in chapter 21, then this bespeaks a situation of grave personal danger. Specifically, it means that by the time these passages were addressed to the community, the evangelist had begun to fear that their faith could cost them their lives. The source of this anxiety is not difficult to discover: Jn 16.2, which also belongs to this late stratum in the Gospel, supplies the context nicely. The reference in this verse to the coming hour when killing the faithful will be considered an act of worship[11] confirms that he believed that the community's rapidly deteriorating relations with Judaism were about to enter a new and deadlier phase.[12] In sum, when John encourages his readers to lay down their lives in imitation of Jesus, his message to them amounts to a grim invitation to face the prospect of martyrdom.

It seems that 1 John has guided us well in a number of ways. By appealing to his text, we have established that the evangelist drew his references to the love command and to Jesus laying down his life from the tradition available to him. We have also found that he shares 1 John's attitude that the Christian duty to fulfil the love command consists in imitating Jesus' self-sacrifice. In one particular respect, however, his message to his own readers has proved radically different

11. So I interpret John's λατρείαν προσφέρειν here. Both λατρεία and λατρεύειν are synonymous with worship (see Rom. 9.4 for the noun; for the verb, see esp. Mt. 4.10//Lk. 4.8 [quoting Deut. 6.13]; Rom. 1.25) and both relate to performing a ritual action of some kind (Rom. 12.1; Heb. 9.6 [noun]; Lk. 2.37; Rom. 1.9; see esp. Heb. 8.4-5; 9.9; 10.1-2, where προσφέρειν is also used). The single instance of the phrase suggests that John has a specific circumstance in mind and it implies that the act of killing Christians has its own sickening theological rationale. Perhaps Paul's recollections of his former life as a Pharisee and zealous persecutor of the church best capture the flavour of John's expression, see esp. Gal. 1.13-14; Phil. 3.5-6.

12. Lindars has successfully demonstrated that Jn 15.18–16.4a was composed with the threat to life indicated in 16.2 in mind ('Persecution of Christians', pp. 137-50). My own observations on 15.12-17 and 21.15-19 at once support Lindars's approach and extend the range of passages written from this perspective.

from the teaching in the epistle: where he has applied this principle to the disciples in the Gospel story, he has taken the obligation to lay down one's life in absolutely literal terms. We are thus provided with compelling evidence in favour of a community situation at the time which was, in the author's estimation at least, potentially life-threatening.[13]

The Tradition on Love in the Lazarus Story

Armed with these insights, we now return to negotiate with the evangelist alone and, in particular, to try to discover his intentions in the Lazarus account. This time round, however, we have the advantage of knowing where to begin. Of the range of Gospel references to laying down life, we have already identified Jn 15.13 as the text which comes closest to 1 John's citation of the tradition in 3.16. For our purposes this is extremely valuable: it means that we can also identify 15.13 as the text where the tradition the evangelist knew, and which will have inspired his composition, has been rendered in its least refracted form. Thus, if we seek to understand what the evangelist has in mind when he speaks of love, our starting point must be Jesus' own definition and self-portrait in 15.13, ἵνα τις τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ θῇ ὑπὲρ τῶν φίλων αὐτοῦ ('to lay down one's life for one's friends'). And now, finally, it becomes possible to understand the import of John's emphasis on Lazarus's status as someone whom Jesus loves at the outset of his story in chapter 11. Seen from this perspective, the phrase ὃν φιλεῖς in 11.3 emerges as an early intimation that the tradition enshrined in 15.13 has informed his composition of the Lazarus episode. In effect, this story shows Jesus in the conscious act of laying down his life for Lazarus and, by implication, for all those who are Jesus' φίλοι. Both the setting of the story and further details within it confirm that this is the message John intends to convey.

John's raising account is set against the background of the increasing hostility of 'the Jews' towards Jesus which has culminated in their attempts to stone and to seize him in Jerusalem (10.22-39). Before the narrative proper begins, however, John has Jesus retire to a place of safety beyond the Jordan (v. 40) which is where Jesus is when he learns that Lazarus is ill (11.3). The brilliance of this little piece of stagecraft should not go unremarked. At a stroke, John has contrived to ensure

13. As Lindars rightly recognizes, it is impossible to tell how far John's fears became reality ('Persecution of Christians', p. 148).

that Jesus' decision to travel to Bethany and give life to Lazarus is also a decision to place his own life in jeopardy by re-entering Judaea. Furthermore, John has no intention of allowing this state of affairs to pass unnoticed. The disciples' reminder in 11.8 of the recent attempt by 'the Jews' on Jesus' life (10.31) spells out in no uncertain terms the personal cost involved in this decision, as does Thomas's remark in v. 16 which acknowledges that the journey to Bethany is a journey towards death. The disciples' fears are also anticipatory of what comes next, for John has arranged that this final sign will be instrumental in sealing Jesus' fate at the hands of the Jewish authorities (vv. 45-53). When he describes the council meeting, John gives pride of place to Caiaphas's expedient, ἵνα εἷς ἄνθρωπος ἀποθάνῃ ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ ('that one man should die for the people') (v. 50). The formal similarity between this pronouncement and the ἵνα clause in 15.13 is quite noticeable. Moreover, John's own application of this 'prophecy' to the τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ in v. 52 shows that he intends it to bear the same meaning.[14]

As for further details within the story itself, the above description of its context has already highlighted the relevance of the disciples' remarks in 11.8 and 11.16 to John's scheme. Three more internal features remain to be considered. First, there is Jesus' declaration in the programmatic v. 4 that the purpose of the illness is ἵνα δοξασθῇ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ δι' αὐτῆς ('so that the Son of God may be glorified by means of it'). Here John picks up on the hint he has already offered in the previous verse by presenting the ailing Lazarus as someone whom Jesus loves: it is Lazarus's illness which will bring Jesus to the cross. Second, there is the emotional turmoil which John attributes to Jesus in vv. 33-35. I have already commented on this from the perspective of 'the Jews' in the opening paragraph of this chapter. Certainly John intends Jesus' love for Lazarus to be seen as the cause of this distress, which is why he has raised the subject again in the remark by 'the Jews' in v. 36. However, the sheer intensity of the emotion suggests that John also intends his readers to see more in this than sorrow at the death of a friend. In fact, what John has provided here is a graphic portrayal of Jesus' agony in Gethsemane on the eve of his own death; the only difference is in the backdrop: for Gethsemane now read Bethany. Finally, there is the fact that Jesus actually uses the term

14. See above, Chapter 1 n. 41.

φίλος when speaking of Lazarus in v. 11. This is a direct link with the tradition in 15.13.[15] Seen in this light, the added fact that John has preferred the cognate verb φιλεῖν when referring to Jesus' affection for Lazarus *alone* in this story (vv. 3, 36) is difficult to dismiss as pure coincidence.[16]

Thus, in context as well as content, John's story is designed to leave his readers in no doubt that Jesus has sacrificed his life for the sake of someone he loves. In this respect, then, John's raising miracle can be understood as an exposition of the tradition in 15.13 in narrative form. Even so, however, it must be said that, apart from the emphasis on love and the notable use of φίλος, neither the story nor its immediate context contains explicit reference to the actual wording of the tradition. Given that subtlety is not usually John's strong point when he wants his readers to get the message, we might be forgiven for expecting him to have trailed his coat rather more obviously than this. However, a further glance at the contents of chapter 10, which functions generally to set the scene for the Lazarus episode, will quickly show that this has not been necessary.

The theme that dominates chapter 10 is John's presentation of Jesus as the Good Shepherd in vv. 11-18. This image is drawn from the

15. The two texts are linked by Barrett (*Gospel*, p. 392) and Culpepper (*Anatomy*, p. 141). See also R.H. Lightfoot's comment that 'the Lord is laying down His life for His friend, and there can be no greater love than this' (*St. John's Gospel: A Commentary* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956], p. 223).

16. For the suggestion that John's choice of verb here anticipates the cognate φίλος in 15.14-15, see D.A. Carson, *The Gospel According to John* (Leicester: IVP; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), p. 406. The point here is not that John used φιλεῖν and ἀγαπᾶν with any difference in meaning (*pace* E. Evans, 'The Verb ἀγαπᾶν in the Fourth Gospel', in F.L. Cross [ed.], *Studies in the Fourth Gospel* [London: Mowbray, 1957], pp. 64-71; C. Spicq, *Agapè dans le Nouveau Testament* [3 vols.; Ebib; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1959–66], III, pp. 219-45, although Spicq does make an exception in the case of Jn 11.3-5 [pp. 223-24]; Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, II, p. 323; see rather, Barrett, *Gospel*, p. 390; Bultmann, *Gospel*, p. 397 n. 2; Carson, *Gospel*, p. 406; G.L. Bartholomew, 'Feed my Lambs: John 21.15-19 as Oral Gospel', *Semeia* 39 [1987], pp. 69-96 [76-77]; W. Günther, 'Love', *NIDNTT*, II, p. 548; and J.P. Louw, 'On Johannine Style', *Neot* 20 [1986], pp. 5-12 [6-7]). Rather, it is to raise the possibility that he has opted for φιλεῖν in these instances because the tradition enshrined in 15.13 is in his head. Could the same be true of the switch from ἀγαπᾶν to φιλεῖν for Jesus' third question to Peter in 21.17, noting that it comes just before the prediction that Peter will fulfil his vow to lay down his life for Jesus (21.18-19; cf. 13.37-38)?

chapter's opening verses and it surfaces again later in the Temple scene when Jesus speaks to 'the Jews' who will soon attempt to stone him (vv. 26-28; cf. v. 31). For our purposes, however, it is crucial to note John's description of what constitutes the good shepherd, whom he has already identified as Jesus, in v. 11: ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ τίθησιν ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων. Here, adapted to the imagery of its surroundings, but unmistakable nevertheless, is the actual wording of the tradition in 15.13 which has been absent from the Lazarus episode. In other words, John has seen no need to alert his readers twice. The essential elements of the tradition are already in place in this verse, and they are repeated in whole or in part in the rest of the passage (vv. 15, 17, 18). This being the case, John has been able to follow up this pastoral adaptation of the tradition, complete with a convenient reminder in the context of the threat from 'the Jews',[17] with a narrative exposition of the same in the Lazarus episode knowing that only the odd light touch need be added there to signal his intentions.[18]

17. Note again his deliberate reference to that situation in 11.8.

18. In fact, it appears that the tradition in 15.13 has had an effect on quite a number of passages in the Gospel. So far we have noted its influence on the Good Shepherd material in 10.11-18, the Lazarus story in 11.1-44, the dictum of Caiaphas and its interpretation in 11.50-52 (the formulation of Peter's vow in 13.37-38, and the sequel to that scene in 21.15-19. However, it is quite clear that the image of Jesus as one who lays down his life for his own also informs the Johannine account of the footwashing, where Jesus' action is expressly described as an example to the disciples, see 13.14-15 and note esp. the use of τίθημι in v. 4 (see Culpepper, *Anatomy*, p. 118; B.G. Schuchard, *Scripture within Scripture: The Interrelationship of Form and Function in the Explicit Old Testament Citations in the Gospel of John* [SBLDS, 133; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992], p. 110 n. 19; and esp. the excellent discussion on this text in Ruth B. Edwards's essay, 'The Christological Basis of the Johannine Footwashing', in J.B. Green and M. Turner [eds.], *Jesus of Nazareth: Lord and Christ. Essays on the Historical Jesus and New Testament Christology* [Festschrift I. Howard Marshall; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1994], pp. 367-83 [372-74]). The pastoral version in chapter 10 also influences John's scene of the arrest in 18.1-11, the point where Jesus actually does give his life for the safety of his 'sheep' (see Barrett, *Gospel*, pp. 520-21; Lindars, *Gospel*, p. 542; see also M.W.G. Stibbe, *John as Storyteller: Narrative Criticism and the Fourth Gospel* [SNTSMS, 73; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992], pp. 100-103, whose diagrammatic representation of the links between chapters 10 and 18 is particularly effective [p. 103]). I note with interest that John Ashton has recently argued that Jn 10.1-18 also belongs to the Gospel's second

So far our study of the Lazarus story from this perspective has concentrated on the extent to which John's presentation of Jesus himself has been informed by the tradition in 15.13 and the care he has taken to ensure that his readers catch his drift. Essentially, he is reminding them that Jesus laid down his life for their sakes, and his emphasis in 11.3 on Lazarus's status as someone whom Jesus loves shows that he has lost no time in inviting them to see Lazarus in this representative role.[19] However, there remains one aspect of the story that I have not yet touched on in this connection, which indicates clearly that John has intended his readers not only to appreciate his point but also to act upon it. In order to put this in context, it will be helpful first to recall what we were able to establish about the evangelist's approach to this tradition elsewhere in the Gospel in the section on John and 1 John earlier in the chapter. Three points emerged from that discussion which are especially relevant here. These are as follows: first, where the evangelist has applied this tradition to the disciples, he has interpreted the Christian obligation to imitate Jesus by laying down one's life in absolutely literal terms; second, the evidence for this occurs in certain passages generally acknowledged to belong to a relatively late stage in the Gospel's development; and third, such a policy attests John's conviction that the community was at that time under threat of severe persecution, the specific details of which he has outlined in 16.2. Now from what we already know about the Lazarus story, we can say immediately that it compares with these other passages in two respects: first, this text is also generally acknowledged to be a late addition to the Gospel;[20] and, second, the evangelist's interest in expounding the

edition, at which point the community's relationship with Judaism had dramatically worsened and lives were at risk ('The Shepherd', in *idem*, *Studying John: Approaches to the Fourth Gospel* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994], pp. 114-40, esp. pp. 127-29). If this is correct, then the case for continuity between the shepherd material and the Lazarus account is further strengthened.

19. Presumably this tradition also underlies John's references to the disciple 'whom Jesus loved' (13.23; 19.26; 20.2; 21.7, 20), who is a key identity figure for the community. However, it does not follow from the fact that Jesus is said to have loved both figures that Lazarus and the beloved disciple are one and the same. This is a tired theory which ought to be laid to rest, as most commentators today agree. It is no more stimulating wheeled out in new narrative-critical garb, *pace* Stibbe, *John as Storyteller*, pp. 78-82.

20. See, e.g., Lindars, *Behind the Fourth Gospel*, p. 60; *idem*, *Gospel*, pp. 50, 381-82; R.E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John* (2 vols.; AB, 29, 29A; Garden

tradition that Jesus laid down his life is also well in evidence here. These similarities strongly suggest that the Lazarus episode comes from roughly the same period as these other passages and was designed to address the same life-threatening circumstances. The aspect of the story I will now discuss offers a further, and convincing, argument in favour of this proposal, for it confirms that an integral part of the evangelist's message to his readers in this account is a call to act in imitation of Jesus and face the prospect of martyrdom.[21] The evidence is as follows.

Predictably enough, the relevant passage is 11.7-16, the one section in the entire story where John focuses attention on the disciples. It begins where Jesus' proposal to return to Judaea is greeted by the disciples' dismayed response in which they remind him of the recent attempt by 'the Jews' on his life (vv. 7-8). Already, John has made the two points he needs to launch his argument: the disciples' reaction in v. 8 serves to emphasize the personal risk involved in Jesus' decision to travel to Bethany; and meanwhile, the first person plural ἄγωμεν in v. 7 indicates that Jesus expects the disciples to accompany him on his mission. With the disciples now committed to advancing with Jesus into the danger zone, John has Jesus respond with some words of support and encouragement.

At first glance, Jesus' reply in 11.9-10 looks like a floating piece of Johannine verbiage which has lodged here for no apparent reason. However, it is, in fact, a parable whose message is singularly apt in the present context. Superficially, it presents a self-evident truth. The rhetorical question appeals to the universal experience that a day is of limited duration (v. 9a) from which it follows that those who travel in daylight do not stumble because they can see (v. 9b) whereas those who travel at night do stumble because they cannot see (v. 10).[22] So far, we are left agog with indifference. Nevertheless, there is scarcely a word of this truism which does not resonate with teaching elsewhere in

City, NY: Doubleday, 1966; London: Chapman, 1971), I, pp. xxxvii, 428; Ashton, *Understanding*, pp. 201-203.

21. *Pace* Hengel, *Question*, p. 117, this situation is not to be assigned to the community's past but was a live issue at the time of writing.

22. At this level of meaning, the φῶς τοῦ κόσμου τούτου in v. 9b is understood to be the sun (so Bernard, *Gospel*, II, p. 377; Brown, *Gospel*, I, p. 423) and the one who does not have the light ἐν αὐτῷ (v. 10b) is unable to see (cf. Mt. 6.23; see further, Barrett, *Gospel*, p. 392).

the Gospel, and this is the tell-tale sign that it is transparent of a deeper meaning, the key to which lies in its application. In fact, the application is twofold and a prior knowledge of 9.4, which has obvious links with the present passage,[23] is indispensable to understanding how it works.

Initially, its thrust is christological. Jesus' rhetorical question, οὐχὶ δώδεκα ὧραί εἰσιν τῆς ἡμέρας; ('Are there not twelve hours in the day?') (11.9a), is in direct response to the disciples' *caveat* in v. 8 and recalls his determination in 9.4 to continue doing God's work in the short time remaining before the onset of the 'night' of the Passion (cf. 13.30). Thus, the message here is that the day of work in 9.4 has not yet run its course and even now, in the very shadow of the cross, Jesus' resolve to pursue his mission remains fixed. For what comes next, it is important to remember that the statement in 9.4 has not applied to Jesus alone, but that there the first person plural ἡμᾶς (cf. Jesus' ἄγωμεν in 11.7) has already drawn in the disciples as participants in Jesus' mission. It is this secondary, ecclesiological aspect of 9.4 which comes abruptly into focus in 11.9b-10. Accordingly, although the day/night imagery reappears here, it acquires a different connotation. We hear now of walking in the day safely as opposed to stumbling at night. Add to this the reference in v. 9b to seeing τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου τούτου and the saying as a whole transposes easily into another instance of the exhortation to walk in the light shed by Jesus in the world which is a special feature of this section of the Gospel (cf. 8.12; 9.5; 12.35, cf. vv. 36, 46). It is not true to say, however, that this teaching has been reintroduced here purely to make the Lazarus episode look at home in its present setting.[24] There is no doubt that it also has a specific function within the story itself, and this is determined by its immediate context. In itself it affirms categorically that authentic human existence consists solely in the Christian calling. However, its placement immediately after Jesus' decision to continue his God-given mission at the risk of his own life is undoubtedly designed to stiffen the resolve of those who continue Jesus' work in the world to remain true to that calling and stand fast in the face of persecution.[25]

Having established that the hallmark of Christian discipleship is to

23. So B.F. Westcott, *The Gospel According to St. John* (London: John Murray, 1882), p. 165; Bernard, *Gospel*, II, p. 377; Bultmann, *Gospel*, p. 398; Barrett, *Gospel*, p. 391; and Dodd, *Historical Tradition*, p. 374.

24. *Pace* Brown, *Gospel*, I, p. 432.

25. On this application, see esp. Dodd, *Historical Tradition*, pp. 377-79.

live in imitation of Jesus at whatever cost, John turns now to provide an update on Lazarus's condition (vv. 11-14). As he does so, however, he creates a small pause in the narrative (ταῦτα εἶπεν) in order to allow time for the deeper meaning of the parable to register.[26] And well he might, because this is the context in which the impact of Jesus' first words to the disciples in v. 11 can be fully appreciated: Λάζαρος ὁ φίλος ἡμῶν κεκοίμηται ('Our friend Lazarus has fallen asleep'). As we observed earlier, the term φίλος is a direct link with the tradition in 15.13. But look now at the possessive pronoun. Once again we have the plural: Lazarus is not only Jesus' φίλος but is billed as a friend of the whole company. Once again also, John has bonded the disciples together with Jesus in a common purpose, and this time with specific reference to the tradition that Jesus laid down his life for his φίλοι. The implications are obvious: just as Jesus will lay down his life for Lazarus, so those who walk in his light must be ready to give theirs. Seen from this perspective, the appearance of ἡμῶν alongside φίλος in this verse signifies that the tradition in 15.13 has been applied also to the disciples. This is consistent with what we have already observed of John's treatment of this tradition in other late passages. Moreover, in this case in particular, it is beyond doubt that he intends his readers to contemplate imitating Jesus' self-sacrifice in absolutely literal terms.

We come now to the final part of the pericope (vv. 15-16). By this time Jesus has managed to drill it into the disciples that Lazarus is actually dead (v. 14). He now points out that this circumstance will prove an occasion for faith, and concludes his teaching with the words ἀλλὰ ἄγωμεν πρὸς αὐτόν ('But let us go to him') (v. 15). The repetition of ἄγωμεν from Jesus' original proposal to re-enter Judaea (v. 7) signals a return to the situation in hand and the end of the digression which John began at v. 8. And now, instead of the earlier dismayed response from the disciples, comes Thomas's exhortation to the others, ἄγωμεν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἵνα ἀποθάνωμεν μετ' αὐτοῦ ('Let us also go, that we may die with him') (v. 16). Thomas' copy-cat opening is entirely apt to the context, for a readiness to put one's life on the line in imitation of Jesus is precisely the attitude John has been pressing for throughout the passage. Here, from one faithful disciple to the others, the call to martyrdom is issued by the evangelist to his readers in the

26. So Lindars, *Gospel*, p. 391.

plainest possible terms.[27] Thomas's words are judiciously placed last of all in the scene beyond the Jordan, and John fully intends them to strike home. Be that as it may, however, it is noticeable that Thomas's remark has a decidedly pessimistic air. Following Jesus into the jaws of death may well be his loyal duty as a disciple, but Thomas sees this as a matter of resigned submission to one's fate.[28] This is hardly encouraging, and not quite calculated, one would think, to encourage the faithful to tread the *via crucis*! However, this is not the point. At this stage in the Gospel drama, Thomas in particular is in no position to grasp the situation fully. His appearance in 14.5 finds him hopelessly out of his depth and, although he will eventually learn that Jesus has risen from the dead, even then he will take some convincing (20.24-29).[29] Meanwhile, John has not yet finished with the fortunes of Lazarus. The present passage already contains hints of something more to come (vv. 11b, 15) and, in what follows, John will supply the lack in Thomas's vision in abundance. As a Christian, John believes implicitly that the gift of the risen Jesus to those who follow him faithfully is the absolute guarantee of resurrection to life in the age to come. The miracle of Jesus raising Lazarus from the dead is about to become John's most powerful statement of that conviction.

27. Dodd (*Interpretation*, p. 367), Brown (*Gospel*, I, p. 432) and Beasley-Murray (*John*, p. 189) all compare Thomas's utterance here with Mk 8.34. According to Wilhelm Wuellner, the rhetorical structure of John's narrative in this section is such that 'we have become aware of not one (Lazarus' death), not two (Jesus' and Lazarus' deaths), but three stories altogether (Lazarus', Jesus', and the disciples' God-glorifying deaths) embedded in the surface plot structure' ('Putting Life Back into the Lazarus Story and its Reading: The Narrative Rhetoric of John 11 as the Narration of Faith', *Semeia* 53 [1991], pp. 113-32 [120]).

28. So Bultmann, *Gospel*, p. 400.

29. As Kenneth Grayston puts it, in these later passages 'Thomas is a model of stolid perplexity' (*The Gospel of John* [Epworth Commentaries; London: Epworth Press, 1990], p. 90).

Chapter 3

FROM DEATH TO LIFE

In 11.43-44, John relates how Lazarus emerges alive from the tomb in response to Jesus' call. This is the miracle which John has been variously working towards throughout the entire episode. It is thus at once the close and the climax of his extended account. Lazarus, who was dead beyond any hope of natural recovery (vv. 17, 39), has been spectacularly returned by Jesus to his family and to normal physical life. This means, of course, that Lazarus will eventually die again when his time comes—or possibly sooner if the Jewish authorities have anything to do with it (12.10). In other words, this is a revivification miracle and, as such, is on a par with the raising of Jairus's daughter and of the widow of Nain's son in the Synoptic records (Mk 5.21-43 par.; Lk. 7.11-15).[1] Nevertheless, in one supremely important respect, John's raising account remains in a class of its own. The real difference does not lie in the nature of the miracle but in its presentation, for the fact is that, in John's hands, Lazarus's return from the dead has become a σημεῖον of resurrection to eternal life. This message has already been signalled clearly in Jesus' magisterial revelation to Martha of his powers to give life (11.25-26) and, when it eventually occurs, the miracle itself is offered as a preview of events at the last day.

As is often noted, neither the teaching Martha receives on the Bethany road nor the picture of resurrection evoked by the miracle is new to the Gospel reader. Jesus' authority to give life and to raise the dead on judgment day has already been confirmed and vividly depicted by John in the discourse beginning at 5.19, where Jesus defends his claim to work as God works on the Sabbath (cf. v. 17). Indeed, the teaching in chapter 5 is so closely paralleled in chapter 11 that anyone

1. See also the general references to raising the dead as part of the miracles tradition in Mt. 11.5//Lk. 7.22.

who knows the Gospel cannot fail to connect the two. Accordingly, commentaries on chapter 11 fairly bristle with references to the earlier text, regularly identifying the discourse in general, and 5.24-29 in particular, as the interpretative key to the meaning of the Lazarus sign.[2] Thus, when it comes to the actual teaching the miracle is intended to convey, the good news in chapter 11 is evidently not news; nothing is added here, in fact, to what has already been said, or at least implied, in the earlier chapter.[3]

This déjà vu quality about John's narrative in chapter 11 has obvious implications for our attempt to understand how he has actually created the Lazarus episode. The evidence here strongly suggests that the content of that earlier discourse has, in some sense, played a key role in the making of the Lazarus story. It follows, therefore, that any plausible bid to account for this process must attend to these parallels and attempt some fairly precise definition of the relationship between these two sections of the Gospel.[4]

As a first step in that direction, it is worth reminding ourselves that the discourse material itself will not be an undifferentiated whole. On the contrary, like the rest of the Gospel, this too will be the usual skilful compound of tradition and interpretation of tradition which is the familiar hallmark of John's work. Once this is granted, immediately the whole issue of John's interest in and indebtedness to this passage in the later chapter becomes rather more complex. This means that John's 'source' for the Lazarus story in this case is itself already composite; it is a composition of John's own, a literary construct with tradition and exposition already in its make-up. This being so, then in order to understand precisely how this material has contributed to the later chapter, it is plain that some preliminary analysis of the structure and

2. See esp. Barrett, *Gospel*, pp. 388, 395-96, 403; Beasley-Murray, *John*, pp. 190-91, 195; Brown, *Gospel*, I, pp. 434, 437; Carson, *Gospel*, pp. 412-13, 418; Lindars, *Gospel*, pp. 383, 395, 402; Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, II, pp. 330, 340, 515 n. 44; G.S. Sloyan, *John* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1988), p. 140; also Dodd, *Interpretation*, pp. 364-66.

3. See esp. Lindars's remarks on this in *Gospel*, p. 383; *idem*, *Behind the Fourth Gospel*, p. 55.

4. Note that Fortna's analysis of the Lazarus story has been undertaken with no reference whatsoever to these parallels. This puts a serious question mark against the contours of the 'pre-Johannine source' he claims to have recovered from the chapter (see *Gospel of Signs*, pp. 74-87; *Predecessor*, pp. 94-109). See further below, Chapter 5 n. 152.

internal logic of the 'source' itself is called for. Thus, this time our investigation into the making of the Lazarus story must begin by moving one stage back, that is, by concentrating initially on the discourse material in chapter 5, with special reference to vv. 24-29. With this in mind, we must first attempt to discern the tradition John will inevitably have used as the basis for this composition.

One glance at the character of 5.19-47, however, is enough to show that it is not at all obvious from a Synoptic standpoint what that tradition might be. This is Johannine discourse material and there is no match for it in the Synoptic record.[5] Thus, while it is not impossible to trace John's progress through the chapter so far by using Synoptic coordinates,[6] at this point he is well out on his own, launched into an argument in which his community's special interests are uppermost. For the remainder of the chapter, John's Jesus will variously expound the significance of his claim in v. 17 to do God's Sabbath work. In the process, he will defend himself against the charge of blasphemy brought against him by 'the Jews' in the Gospel narrative (5.18; cf. 10.33) and, almost certainly, brought also against John's community at the time of writing by an increasingly hostile Judaism.[7]

5. On the distinctive form of the Johannine discourse, see J.L. Bailey and L.D. Vander Broek, *Literary Forms in the New Testament* (London: SPCK, 1992), pp. 172-76.

6. Note the following points of contact: the command to the paralytic (Jn 5.8//Mk 2.9; cf. Mt. 9.6; Lk. 5.24); the reference to a crowd (Jn 5.13; Mt. 9.8; Mk 2.4; Lk. 5.19); the connection with sin (Jn 5.14; Mt. 9.2; Mk 2.5; Lk. 5.20); the claim to do God's work (Jn 5.17; Mt. 9.6; Mk 2.10; Lk. 5.24); and the blasphemy charge (Jn 5.18; Mt. 9.3; Mk 2.7; Lk. 5.21).

7. J.L. Martyn's widely accepted proposal that John's quarrel with Judaism stems from the introduction by the Jamnia authorities of the *birkat ha-minim* into synagogue worship has been successfully challenged in recent years (J.L. Martyn, *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel* [Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2nd rev. edn, 1979], pp. 37-62; *idem*, 'Glimpses into the History of the Johannine Community', in *idem*, *The Gospel of John in Christian History: Essays for Interpreters* [Theological Inquiries; New York: Paulist Press, 1978], pp. 90-121; but see R. Kimelman, '*Birkat Ha-Minim* and the Lack of Evidence for an Anti-Christian Jewish Prayer in Late Antiquity', in E.P. Sanders, A.I. Baumgaten and A. Mendelson [eds.], *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition* [3 vols.; London: SCM Press, 1980–82], II, pp. 226-44; also, quoting Kimelman and others, J.A.T. Robinson, *The Priority of John* [ed. J.F. Coakley; London: SCM Press, 1985], pp. 72-81). In fact, the Johannine evidence suggests the impact of something more drastic (so Lindars, 'Persecution of Christians', p. 134; endorsed by W. Horbury in 'The

As it stands in the Gospel, 5.24-29 is a part of this extended argument. It is here that John spells out the eschatological implications of Jesus' God-given authority to give life and to judge, which he has already confirmed in the previous verses. Accordingly, the passage begins with an affirmation of Jesus' powers to bestow eternal life in the present on those who believe (v. 24). As it proceeds, the present soon shades into the future (v. 25) until, after suitable reminders of Jesus' divinely appointed status, there emerges the full-scale apocalyptic picture of the eschaton in which Jesus raises the dead to life or to judgment (vv. 28-29). If this thumb-nail sketch is reasonably accurate, then it appears that the basis of John's argument here, and thus the growth-point of the whole passage, lies in the opening verse. Because of this, and also because v. 24 begins with John's double ἀμήν formula (repeated in v. 25)—which not only functions to draw attention to what follows but may also signify the presence of a Jesus logion—[8] this looks like the most promising point to begin our search for tradition. Even so, however, both the 'realized' eschatology of the verse and its diction are thoroughly Johannine, and these are factors which can all too easily sabotage attempts to identify Synoptic equivalents. The alternative is to appeal to 1 John. In so doing, we will not only be comparing like with like in terms of diction but will also gain access to

Benediction of the *Minim* and Early Jewish–Christian Controversy', *JTS* NS 33 [1982], pp. 19-61, cf. pp. 52, 60). Blasphemy was punishable by death in Jewish law (Lev. 24.16; cf. Jn 16.2) and is the key charge against which John vigorously defends Jesus' divine claims (5.19-47; 10.34-38; cf. 19.7). This suggests that the fundamental issue in this case was internal to Judaism, a 'family row' over the meaning of monotheism at a time when John's flexible approach was too dangerously familiar to be tolerated (see the excellent discussion in Ashton, *Understanding*, pp. 137-59 and also his remarks in 'Bridging Ambiguities', in *idem*, *Studying John*, pp. 71-89, esp. pp. 72-73; see further P. Hayman, 'Monotheism—A Misused Word in Jewish Studies?', *JJS* 42 [1991], pp. 1-15, esp. p. 15).

8. Lindars's suggestion that John's characteristic double ἀμήν can signal a traditional Jesus-saying (see *Behind the Fourth Gospel*, p. 44; *idem*, *Gospel*, p. 48) is dismissed as 'unnecessary' by Margaret Davies, who prefers to define the formula as 'a stylistic device which draws attention to crucial assertions' (M. Davies, *Rhetoric and Reference in the Fourth Gospel* [JSNTSup, 69; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992], p. 269). However, Lindars himself was quite aware that John could use this feature purely for effect (cf. *Behind the Fourth Gospel*, p. 46). Moreover, since what John deems to be 'crucial' could well involve traditional material in any case, there is no reason to suppose that either position excludes the other.

Johannine thinking on eschatology by a different route. As we shall see, the epistle writer has his own position on this issue.

Eschatology in 1 John: A Shared Tradition

In his commentary on the Johannine epistles, C.H. Dodd remarks on the curious fact that 1 John makes no direct reference to Jesus' resurrection.[9] In fact, the epistle never mentions resurrection at all, an omission which comes as something of a surprise after what we have just seen of eschatology in the Gospel. Nevertheless, it would be a mistake to infer from this that the epistolary author is not overly concerned with matters eschatological. On the contrary, his remarks in 2.18 readily confirm that he is fully alert to events on the eschatological calendar. In that verse, he announces to his readers that it is the 'last hour' (ἐσχάτη ὥρα), by which he appears to mean something like 'the eleventh hour', that is, the final time *before* judgment day rather than judgment day itself.[10] His accompanying reference to the coming of 'antichrist' confirms this chronology. Although the actual term ἀντίχριστος is confined in the New Testament to 1 and 2 John (1 Jn 2.18, 22; 4.3; 2 Jn 7)—and, on that account, may have been specially minted by our author[11]—the concept it denotes of a grand diabolical apostasy and deception of many in the last times is a familiar stock-in-trade of the Judaeo-Christian tradition.[12] Among New Testament examples, the great dragon in Revelation 12 and the false christs and false prophets of the Synoptic apocalypses immediately spring to mind, as does also Paul's ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἀνομίας, ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας ('man of lawlessness, the son of perdition') (2 Thess. 2.3), who is Satan's creature (v. 9) and who will be destroyed by Jesus at the parousia (v. 8). In the light of these parallels, it is hardly startling to find that

9. C.H. Dodd, *The Johannine Epistles* (Moffatt New Testament Commentary; London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1946), p. xxxiii.

10. See esp. R. Schnackenburg, *Die Johannesbriefe* (HTKNT, 13; Freiburg: Herder, 1975), p. 142 with n. 2.

11. Either that, or it was a coinage of the Johannine school, so Brown, *Epistles*, p. 333.

12. See esp. Schnackenburg's careful investigation into the term in *Johannesbriefe*, pp. 145-49; also G. Strecker, *Die Johannesbriefe* (Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament, 40; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989), pp. 337-43.

1 John looks forward eagerly to the eschaton. In 2.17, he has already assured his readers that the world, like the darkness (cf. 2.8), is passing away and, in what follows, he encourages them to greet 'the day of judgment' and 'his coming' with confidence (2.28; 4.17; cf. 3.2).[13]

This sense of an imminent eschaton and preoccupation with details of the end-time that we find in 1 John do not readily invite comparisons with the Gospel. While the evangelist's eschatology certainly includes the future dimension, there is nothing to suggest that he thinks that the 'last day' (ἔσχατη ἡμέρα), as he puts it (6.39, 40, 44, 54; 11.24; 12.48), is about to dawn, nor does he appear to dwell on the signs of its approach. Nevertheless, it does not do to overplay the differences between John and 1 John in eschatological terms. There are, in fact, certain other features about both documents which argue in favour of a fundamental similarity with differences in emphasis rather than in kind.[14]

First, there is the epistle's *Sitz im Leben* to consider. We may infer from 1 Jn 2.19 that there has recently been a serious rift within the community which has resulted in the exodus of what was probably a sizeable proportion of its membership. Quite clearly, it is this defection which has prompted the author to declare to his readers in the previous verse that antichrist is abroad and the final evil is upon them. The epistle's eschatological stance is thus directly related to contemporary community circumstances. There is nothing in the Gospel to betray the presence of such a major upheaval within the community in the evangelist's time. There, the threat to the community's existence is coming from outside and, although the possibility of apostasy on that account is not ruled out (cf. 15.6; 16.1; 17.11, 21-23, etc.), the actual evidence of this is slight (cf. 6.60-71, esp. v. 66) and relatively little space is

13. This assumes that the αὐτός in 2.28b refers to Jesus and not God, although this is by no means clear from the context (see 'born of him' in v. 29, which must refer to God, cf. 3.1; Jn 1.12-13). Lieu is surely correct in attributing this ambiguity to imprecision of thought rather than to any 'deliberate ambivalence' on the author's part (Lieu, *Theology*, pp. 72-73; *pace* Smalley, *1, 2, 3 John*, p. 133).

14. This point is well made by Whitacre in an argument which is heavily critical of the views of Dodd, Conzelmann and Klein in particular (*Johannine Polemic*, pp. 162-66). But see also more recently Robert Kysar's remarks on 1 John's emphasis 'on the futuristic eschatology with little, if any, evidence of the present, realized eschatology we have come to know in the Fourth Gospel' (*John: The Maverick Gospel* [Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, rev. edn, 1993], p. 141).

devoted to dealing with it.[15] Even so, however, it is interesting to observe the evangelist's reaction at this point. Note how quickly his talk turns to betrayal (6.64) and how the Satan-inspired figure of Judas Iscariot is drawn into the picture (vv. 70-71; cf. 13.2, 27), the same figure whom, later in 17.12, John refers to as ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας (note the Pauline parallel, p. 58).[16] Thus, it seems that 1 John's eschatologically orientated response to secession from the community is not without some minor representation in the evangelist's text.

A second consideration relates to the actual wording of 1 Jn 2.18. The whole tenor of the verse is one of appeal to, and application of, a known concept. Thus, having informed his readers that it is the 'last hour', the author's next move is to refer to the advent of ἀντίχριστος as something familiar to them (καθὼς ἠκούσατε), following which he interprets this datum in the light of present circumstances (καὶ νῦν

15. *Pace* M.W.G. Stibbe (*John's Gospel* [New Testament Readings; London: Routledge, 1994], pp. 107-131), who proposes that Jn 8.31-59 constitutes a satire on apostasy directed at 'the Jews who had believed' in v. 31, who are about to fall away. This is unconvincing on several counts. To begin with, it is difficult to see how Stibbe's description of the passage as 'the fiercest form of pastoral love' (p. 130) is at all adequate to the sheer savagery of the polemic in this case. Second, Stibbe's argument assumes without question that the reference to belief in 8.31 is original to the text (for doubts, see Barrett, *Gospel*, p. 344; Lindars, *Gospel*, p. 323). Third, he neglects to observe that John *never* uses the term 'the Jews' of the faithful within his community. On the contrary, John consistently associates 'the Jews' with the synagogue, which is external to the community and which opposes and threatens it (cf. 9.22; 16.2). This remains true even of 'the Jews' who believe: they do not belong (cf. 12.42) and are at best 'fringe' (cf. B.W. Longenecker, 'The Unbroken Messiah: A Johannine Feature and its Social Functions', *NTS* 41 [1995], pp. 428-41, esp. pp. 434-36). Thus, even as it stands, 8.31 is no match for the apostasy reference at 6.66, which specifies that those who drew back were *disciples*. See further the review of Stibbe's book by Ruth B. Edwards, 'Innovative work on John', in *ExpTim* 106 (1995), pp. 245-46.

16. See Whitacre, *Johannine Polemic*, p. 165, who takes the antichrist references in 1 John and the description of Judas in Jn 17.12 as evidence of a 'historicizing' of eschatological material in both documents. He anticipates me here in citing my short communication, 'Satan in the Fourth Gospel' (in E.A. Livingstone [ed.], *Studia Biblica 1978: II. Papers on The Gospels* [JSNTSup, 2; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980], pp. 307-311) in which I argue that Judas in John's Gospel is symbolic of the final apostasy. The association between Judas and ἀπώλεια/ἀπόλλυμι in John is further explored in my essay, ' "The Scripture" in John 17.12', in B.P. Thompson (ed.), *Scripture: Meaning and Method* (Festschrift Anthony Tyrrell Hanson; Hull: Hull University Press, 1987), pp. 24-36, esp. pp. 28-31.

ἀντίχριστοι πολλοὶ γεγόνασιν ['so now many antichrists have come'], cf. v. 19a). The phrase καθὼς ἠκούσατε ('as you have heard') here is to be compared with ὃ ἀκηκόατε ('of which you have heard') in 4.3, where this teaching is substantially repeated. In both cases, the signal is unmistakable that 1 John is tapping into the community's eschatological tradition.[17] This being the case, it is unrealistic to suppose that the eschatological concepts referred to by 1 John could not have been circulating in the community as part of its Jewish-Christian heritage at the point when the Gospel was written. Indeed, the evangelist's reference to Judas as ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας ('the son of perdition') (see above) strongly suggests that they were. Moreover, if the same author's obvious determination to dampen down expectations among 'the brethren' in the case of the death of the beloved disciple is anything to go by (21.22-23), we must also conclude that there were at least some in the community at that time who, notwithstanding the evangelist's preferences, had been quite capable of espousing the view that the eschaton was imminent.[18]

Finally—and, for our purposes, most importantly—there is the epistle writer's emphasis on the community's present experience of the blessings of the age to come. In this respect, it can plausibly be argued that 1 John's eschatology is as 'anticipated' or 'realized' as that of the evangelist.[19] Thus, while he may differ from the evangelist in the timing of the eschaton, the epistle writer's conviction that the faithful already participate in the promised rewards of that day is just as marked as his predecessor's. In fact, it is precisely on this basis that he urges his readers to face the coming event without shame, without fear, and with all 'boldness' or 'confidence' (παρρησία, 2.28; 4.17-18).

This emphasis on what believers already have and are is noticeable as early as 2.7. Here the epistle writer speaks explicitly of the love command for the first time. As far as he is concerned, the keeping of this commandment is the supreme distinguishing feature of the true Christian. In v. 8, he pronounces it to be καινή inasmuch as it is a

17. So, e.g., Strecker, *Johannesbriefe*, p. 123: 'Dass der Antichrist kommen wird, ist ein der Gemeinde bekannter Lehrsatz, wie der Rückverweis καθὼς ἠκούσατε besagt'; also Schnackenburg, *Johannesbriefe*, p. 143.

18. This passage will be discussed in detail below.

19. This aspect of 1 John's thought is properly stressed by Lieu (*Theology*, pp. 27-31, 88). However, I see no reason not to take the author's references to the coming eschaton with equal seriousness (*pace* Lieu, *Theology*, pp. 89-90).

reality (ἀληθές) in Jesus and in his readers. He can do this because they already belong to the sphere of light and to God (v. 10; cf. 1.5), and hence also to the newness of the future which, he affirms, is already breaking in on the present (v. 8b). As the letter proceeds, the eschatological tone continues and further assurances follow, some of which are also familiar from the evangelist's text. In 2.12-14, we hear that the author's addressees are strong and have their sins forgiven; they have known τὸν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς (probably Jesus)[20] and the Father; they have conquered the evil one and God's word remains in them.[21] In 2.17, their permanent status is contrasted with the world's impermanence,[22] and in the following section they themselves are contrasted with the ἀντίχριστοι in having a χρῖσμα, which teaches them everything (vv. 20-21, 27),[23] and in not denying that Jesus is ὁ χριστός (v. 22).[24] Theirs is thus a proper Christian faith (vv. 23b-24) which

20. See the discussion in Brown, *Epistles*, p. 303.

21. Note the following parallels in the Gospel: (1) Jesus knows the Father (7.29; 8.55; 10.15; 17.25), the disciples know the Father through Jesus (14.7), and eternal life consists in the knowledge of both (17.3, and cf. 1 Jn 5.20; 2.3, 4); (2) Jesus has conquered the world (16.33, and cf. 1 Jn 5.4, 5), which is the realm of the evil one (12.31; cf. 17.15, and cf. 1 Jn 4.4; 5.19) who has no hold over Jesus or over those who believe (14.30; 17.11, 12, 15, and cf. 1 Jn 5.18); (3) true disciples remain in Jesus' words (8.31), who speaks God's word (cf. 3.34; 7.16; 12.48-50; 14.24; 17.14) which remains in them (15.7; contrast 'the Jews', 5.38, cf. 8.37).

22. Compare esp. Jn 8.35, ὁ υἱὸς μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, cf. 12.34. Note also that the reference to doing God's will in 1 Jn 2.17 applies to Jesus at Jn 4.34; 5.30; 6.38, and cf. 1 Jn 5.14.

23. The text of 2.20 is uncertain, reading either 'and you all [πάντες] know' or 'and you know all things [πάντα]'. For the detail, see Brown, *Epistles*, pp. 348-49, who plumps for the former. Yet πάντα is in better agreement with 2.27 and also tallies with the Gospel descriptions of Jesus as knowing 'all things' (16.30; 21.17), as disclosing 'all things' to the disciples (15.15; cf. 4.25, with ἅπαντα), and as promising that the Spirit would carry on this teaching function (14.26).

24. Note the alliteration. Whatever else is going on in this difficult passage, the thrust of it is surely to affirm the centrality to the Johannine faith of the role of Jesus Christ. Could this imply that others in the group (the 'antichrists') have undervalued that role? The varient reading, λύει (i.e 'annuls', 'negates') τὸν Ἰησοῦν, at 4.3 (detail in Brown, *Epistles*, pp. 494-96), suggests that this may have been the case. Lieu, plausibly in my opinion, looks to the character of Johannine Christianity itself, rather than outside it, to account for such a circumstance. She points to the theocentricity that dominates the epistle elsewhere, suggesting that this tendency, if taken to extremes, could result in the devaluation of Jesus' salvific role in the minds of some ('Authority', pp. 220-26). My only quarrel with this is that Lieu does not

inherits the eternal life that was promised by Jesus (v. 25).

In chapter 3, however, our author excels even himself. Launched into the ultimate contrast between the child of God and the child of the devil, his categories could not be more absolute. Verse 9, in particular, is remarkable for the sheer baldness of its claim to Christian impeccability, a claim to eschatological perfection which is quite in keeping with the context, even though it may sit awkwardly with the same author's earlier insistence that Christian sin be acknowledged and confessed (cf. 1.8, 10).[25] From this point on, it will be helpful to follow 1 John's argument carefully.

Up to now, the epistle writer has distinguished God's children from the devil's progeny in terms of doing righteousness or sin. In 3.10, he

take the case for theocentricity far enough in that she prefers to distinguish the epistle over against the Gospel in this regard. However, to do so is to overstate the differences between them and to allow considerations of genre to weigh too heavily. Jesus may be central to the Gospel story, but for John he is not final in himself; rather, he continually functions as the locus of revelation on earth in whom God is to be encountered. In sum, as Gospels go, there is no more theocentric presentation of Jesus than John's. See esp. the discussion in C.K. Barrett, 'Christocentric or Theocentric? Observations on the Theological Method of the Fourth Gospel', in *idem*, *Essays on John* (London: SPCK, 1982), pp. 1-18.

25. Needless to say, the discrepancy between the two passages has provoked a series of explanations from commentators. For example: (1) the two passages address two different problems (so Dodd, *Epistles*, p. 80); (2) 1 Jn 1.8, 10 grapples with empirical reality while 3.9 presents an ideal to be striven for (so R. Bultmann, *The Johannine Epistles* [trans. R.P. O'Hara, L.C. McGaughy and R.W. Funk; Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1973], p. 53); (3) 1 Jn 1.8, 10 refers to the occasional lapse into sin while 3.9 affirms that habitual sin cannot belong to the essential nature of the child of God (so F.F. Bruce, *The Epistles of John* [London: Pickering & Inglis, 1970], p. 92; Grayston, *Epistles*, p. 105; Westcott, *Epistles*, pp. 104, 108; Brooke, *Epistles*, pp. 89-90). See further, the lengthy discussions in Smalley, *1, 2, 3 John*, pp. 159-63 and Brown, *Epistles*, pp. 412-15. Lieu takes the eschatological perfectionism in chapter 3 to be in tension with a 'not yet' approach elsewhere which allows for the reality of sin (*Theology*, esp. pp. 59-61). My own view is that 1 John's thinking is primarily spatial and that 3.9; 5.18 witness the huge distinction in his mind between those *within* the community, for whom forgiveness and life are always available from God and who have Jesus as their advocate (1.9; 5.16; 2.1), and those beyond its bounds, who are thus removed from the sphere of salvation and are at the devil's mercies (5.19) (see above, Chapter 1 n. 26). William Loader suggests something like this when he proposes that 1 John thinks in systems (*The Johannine Epistles* [Epworth Commentaries; London: Epworth Press, 1992], pp. 38-40, 78-79).

states this plainly, but instead of referring again to both categories (cf. vv. 7-8) he simply gives the negative of the former (πᾶς ὁ μὴ ποιῶν δικαιοσύνην, 'whoever does not do right'), which he then defines further as the lack of brotherly love (v. 10c). At this mention, his thought immediately circles back to the material in 2.7-11 and to his contention, which will now receive much stress, that fulfilment of the love command is the outward and visible sign of an authentic Christian experience (see above). Indeed, his introduction of the commandment in 3.11 as ἡ ἀγγελία ἣν ἠκούσατε ἀπ' ἀρχῆς is an obvious match with his earlier descriptions of it as ἀπ' ἀρχῆς and ὁ λόγος ὃν ἠκούσατε in 2.7 itself.[26] His return to the former passage has also furnished him with a second set of opposites, love and hatred (cf. 2.9-11), with which to pursue his contrasts and affirmations. With the addition of the explicit appeal in v. 12 to the story of Cain,[27] devil's child and archetypal murderer, our author's vocabulary of antithesis is complete and, as the polarity continues, the categories of life and death can now join the other two pairs of opposites in a grand melée of mix and match. Thus, in the following verses, we find hatred contrasted with righteousness (v. 13, cf. v. 12), life and love equated over against lovelessness and death (v. 14), and hatred put together with murder and the absence of eternal life (v. 15).

Taken as a whole, this section of the epistle is particularly rich in Gospel parallels and therefore, as I have argued, in instances where the epistolary author has cited traditional material which was known also to the evangelist.[28] Apart from the presence of the love command in v. 11, whose significance I have already explored in Chapter 2, there is the exegesis of the Cain narrative from Genesis 4 in v. 12 which compares well with the acrimonious debate between Jesus and 'the Jews' in John 8.[29] (Note, incidentally, 1 John's explanatory ὅτι τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ πονηρὰ ἦν, 'because his deeds were evil', in v. 12 which suits the Cain-related context [cf. Jn 8.41], but cf. also Jn 3.19; 7.7 for the same

26. Note also that λόγος and ἀγγελία are already treated as equivalents in 1.1-5 (Brown, *Epistles*, p. 165).

27. For the argument that the Cain narrative has been in 1 John's mind from at least 3.7 onwards, see J.M. Lieu, 'What Was from the Beginning: Scripture and Tradition in the Johannine Epistles', *NTS* 39 (1993), pp. 458-77, esp. pp. 470-72; *eadem*, *Theology*, pp. 35, 53.

28. See Chapter 1.

29. Cf. Lieu, 'What Was from the Beginning', p. 471.

stereotyped expression.)[30] In v. 13, moreover, we find the jaundiced maxim on the world's hatred which also features in the Gospel text.[31] For our purposes, however, it is the content of v. 14 which is of key importance. Here, intent on demonstrating the absolute contrast between his readers and the undesirable Cain stereotype, the epistle writer refers them to the *known* truth that they have 'passed out of death into life'.[32] As regards this 'realized' eschatological claim, Gospel and epistle could not be better matched, for the fact is that what the epistle writer has used here is the same formula of words that has surfaced in the evangelist's text in the latter part of 5.24. Thus, with this particular tradition-overlap between John and I John, we have arrived at the evidence that at least part of Jn 5.24 is tradition-based. It is now time to put Gospel and epistle texts together for a direct comparison.

> Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ὁ τὸν λόγον μου ἀκούων καὶ πιστεύων τῷ πέμψαντί με ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον καὶ εἰς κρίσιν οὐκ ἔρχεται, ἀλλὰ μεταβέβηκεν ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου εἰς τὴν ζωήν (Jn 5.24).
>
> ἡμεῖς οἴδαμεν ὅτι μεταβεβήκαμεν ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου εἰς τὴν ζωήν, ὅτι ἀγαπῶμεν τοὺς ἀδελφούς· (1 Jn 3.14).[33]

30. I am indebted to Professor Max Wilcox for directing me to the Targumic tradition on Gen. 4.8 which stresses good deeds as the criterion for God's acceptance of Abel's offering and rejection of Cain's. See the brief mention in M. Wilcox, 'On Investigating the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament', in E. Best and R.McL. Wilson (eds.), *Text and Interpretation: Studies in the New Testament Presented to Matthew Black* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), pp. 231-43 (240); see further Lieu, 'What Was from the Beginning', p. 467; for the texts themselves, discussed in relation to one another, see B. Chilton, 'A Comparative Study of Synoptic Development: The Dispute between Cain and Abel in the Palestinian Targums and the Beelzebul Controversy in the Gospels', *JBL* 101 (1982), pp. 553-62. It is thus not impossible that the stereotype derives ultimately from the Cain traditions. Either that or the expression itself, already a Johannine commonplace, served to attract the Cain exegesis.

31. See above, Chapter 1, n. 47.

32. See Brown, *Epistles*, pp. 424 n. 13, 445 on οἴδαμεν as community terminology signalling tradition.

33. 'Truly, truly, I say to you, he who hears my word and believes him who sent me has eternal life; he does not come into judgment, but *has passed from death to life*' (Jn 5.24).

'We know that *we have passed from death to life*, because we love the brethren' (1 Jn 3.14).

This parallel is instructive in a number of ways. In the first place, it tells us that the final section of the Gospel verse reflects traditional material which consists of an assurance that those who believe in Jesus are no longer subject to the powers of death. Secondly, and more generally, it also tells us that the view, which is commonly held, that the fourth Gospel's 'realized' eschatology was the evangelist's own brainchild[34] needs some modification. Although undoubtedly exploited by him, this shows that the 'realizing' tendency was already written into the Johannine constitution, as it were, before John himself put pen to paper. Thirdly, the fact that the verse contains tradition confirms that its opening ἀμὴν ἀμήν formula is operating as a genuine tradition-signal in this case. As such, the formula indicates the presence of a Jesus logion, at least part of which, we now know, has found expression in Johannine circles in terms of transition from death to life. But what of the rest of the Gospel verse? Are we to assume that John's tradition-signal applies only to its closing section, or are there words in between which are also somehow involved in this logion? Perhaps we have not yet exhausted the amount of help 1 John's text has to offer.

In 1 Jn 3.14, the epistle writer states that the faithful are assured of having passed from death to life 'because we love the brethren'. Thus, as far as he is concerned, possession of eternal life is conditional on fulfilment of the love command. On the face of it, this is not helpful since the love command is nowhere in sight in the Gospel verse nor, for that matter, in its entire context.[35] In terms of the epistle writer's own interests, however, this fills the bill nicely. As we have recognized, obedience to the love command is, for 1 John, the supreme mark of a genuine Christian faith. Thus, its presentation here as a 'test of life'[36] is quite consistent with his own 'handsome is as handsome does' thesis. Nevertheless, if we have correctly followed his line of argument in the previous verses (see above), it is plain that more can be said about the epistle writer's text than this. Set in context, the reference to brotherly love in 3.14 picks up on the love command as given fully in v. 11. Already in that verse, however, 1 John has carefully introduced this commandment to his readers not only as original tradition (ἀπ' ἀρχῆς)

34. See, e.g., Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, II, p. 437; Barrett, *Gospel*, pp. 67-70.

35. For the love command in the Gospel, see 13.34; 15.12, 17.

36. See R. Law, *The Tests of Life* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 3rd edn, 1979), pp. 232-57, esp. p. 240. Law's title is taken up as a heading by Lieu (*Theology*, pp. 49-71).

but also as ἡ ἀγγελία ἣν ἠκούσατε ('the message which you have heard') which, as we observed, is the equivalent of the phrase ὁ λόγος ὃν ἠκούσατε ('the word which you have heard') in 2.7. This puts 3.14 in a different light. It means that in this verse 1 John has yoked together the tradition on having passed from death to life with a reference to the love command on the clear understanding that the command itself is the message or, alternatively, the *word* which his readers have heard. This connection brings us back onto Gospel territory once more. Notice that, according to Jn 5.24a, the one who has passed from death to life is ὁ τὸν λόγον μου ἀκούων.

To sum up the implications of this, I am suggesting that behind both Gospel and epistle and reflected in both texts, although more diffusely in 1 John, there is a Jesus logion which involves not only the promise of eternal life as a present possession but also, linked with it, a reference to hearing Jesus' word, with ἀκούειν probably taken in its Semitic sense of 'hear and obey'.[37] I am also suggesting that, in dealing with this logion, 1 John has operated differently from the evangelist. Out of his own interests, he has gone on to specify that the word of Jesus to be 'heard' *is* the love command. He has therefore equated the two in a way the evangelist has not and, on that basis, has felt free to put that commandment together with the promise of life in 3.14. Even so, however, we must now leave 1 John to his own devices and return to reconsider the Gospel text in the light of our findings so far.

John 5.24 in Synoptic Perspective

In the absence of any discernible parallel in the Synoptic record, comparison with the text of 1 John has enabled us to establish that certain parts of Jn 5.24 reflect community tradition. Introduced by the evangelist as a Jesus logion, the tradition itself appears to consist of a reference to heeding Jesus' word and an assurance of the believer's present transfer from death to life. Even reduced to these basic elements, however, the statement in Jn 5.24 continues to defy Synoptic comparison. Indeed, there is no saying attributed to Jesus which has this format either in the Synoptics or, for that matter, anywhere else in the whole of the New Testament. What are the implications of this? Does it mean, perhaps, that we have here chanced upon an item of tradition known and

37. On this, see esp. Piper, '1 John', p. 437 n. 1; Barrett, *Gospel*, p. 261.

preserved in Johannine circles but not elsewhere? Attractive though this proposition is, it is also not very likely: as has been consistently demonstrated, John's sayings tradition more often than not proves to be an idiomatic version of what the Synoptists report.[38] This raises a second possibility, namely, that this is a logion which is known generally in early Christian tradition but which appears here in a form which is so thoroughly 'johannized' that its Synoptic counterpart is not readily identifiable. Let us explore this second option.

If Jn 5.24 cannot be compared directly with any Synoptic statement, it may be possible to resolve the problem by moving sideways within the Gospel itself to find an equivalent text whose Synoptic links may be less obscured. In order to do this correctly, however, we must be very clear on what 'equivalent' means in this context. What it does not mean is that the whole of 5.24 as it stands comes into the exercise. If that were so, we should soon be spoiled for choice. For instance, the promise of ζωὴ αἰώνιος for those who believe in v. 24a crops up again in 6.40, 47 and occurs in various forms throughout the chapter (cf. 6.27, 51, 54, 58) as well as elsewhere (cf. 4.14; 10.10, 27-28). Nevertheless, it does not link in with the 1 John parallel and, in any case, could well have been drawn into the verse with Jn 3.15-16 in mind, which is where it first appears (cf. also 3.36).[39] What we are actually looking for is something rather different: we need another statement which shows signs of reflecting *the same tradition* whose presence we have already identified in 5.24 with 1 John's help. This means that our equivalent text must feature a reference to hearing or obeying Jesus' word with an accompanying assurance that the believer is already removed from death's realm. Furthermore, taking our cue from John's double ἀμήν signal in 5.24, this must be a statement attributed to Jesus himself. Put in these terms, the issue of finding an equivalent to 5.24 virtually resolves itself. In fact, there is only one other text in the Gospel which displays this particular combination of characteristics, double ἀμήν included, and that is Jn 8.51: ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐάν τις τὸν ἐμὸν λόγον τηρήσῃ, θάνατον οὐ μὴ θεωρήσῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ('Truly, truly, I say to you, if anyone keeps my word, he will never see death').

Thus, Jn 5.24 and 8.51 can be described as true variants in that both

38. See above, Chapter 1 n. 7.
39. The composition of 5.24 will be analysed in detail below.

are statements attributed to Jesus in which the same traditional material has been reflected.[40] In fact, the affinity between them is plain enough from the texts themselves as well as from their contexts. The promises of having passed from death to life (5.24) and of never seeing or experiencing[41] death (8.51) are obvious alternatives. Moreover, although 8.51 refers to 'keeping' Jesus' word rather than 'hearing' it as in 5.24, the meanings of τηρεῖν and ἀκούειν easily overlap in Johannine use and, in any case, references to 'hearing' Jesus' word are already in place in the immediately preceding dialogue (8.43, 47).[42] Note also how the discussion in 8.49 returns to the issue of honouring Jesus and the Father, last aired in 5.23, plus the further reference to judging in 8.50, touched on earlier in the chapter (vv. 15, 16, 26), but indisputably a key theme in the passage 5.22-30.[43]

Despite what alteration there is in the 8.51 version, however, we are still no nearer to identifying a Synoptic counterpart to this tradition. Or are we? Note that Jesus' pronouncement here is not the end of the matter in this passage. Shorn of its double ἀμήν opening, it appears again, this time picked up derisively on the lips of 'the Jews', in 8.52: ἐάν τις τὸν λόγον μου τηρήσῃ, οὐ μὴ γεύσηται θανάτου εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ('If anyone keeps my word, s/he will never taste death'). Thus John has, in fact, furnished us with yet another variant. This is much the same as in the previous verse, except that the phrase 'to see death' in 8.51 has now become 'to taste death' (γεύεσθαι θανάτου). With this second vivid Semitism, we are at once in touch with the Synoptic Jesus. The relevant text is Mk 9.1 (reproduced variously in Mt. 16.28; Lk. 9.27) in which Jesus predicts the coming of God's kingdom in the near future in the following terms: ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι εἰσίν τινες ὧδε τῶν ἑστηκότων οἵτινες οὐ μὴ γεύσωνται θανάτου ἕως ἂν ἴδωσιν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐληλυθυῖαν ἐν δυνάμει ('Truly, I say to you, there are some standing here who will not taste death before they see the kingdom of God come with power').

Needless to say, this parallel has more than once prompted the

40. This much was suspected by Lindars (see 'Traditions', p. 97 n. 34).

41. John's θεωρεῖν at 8.51 is used in this sense, see esp. Bultmann, *Gospel*, p. 324 n. 3, cf. p. 135 n. 2; also Barrett, *Gospel*, p. 350. The use is Semitic.

42. On the close links between τηρεῖν in 8.51 and ἀκούειν in 5.24, see Brown, *Gospel*, I, p. 366. Brown suggests that τηρεῖν may have been preferred in 8.51 to echo the notion of abiding in v. 31; on this see also Beasley-Murray, *John*, p. 137.

43. See esp. Barrett, *Gospel*, p. 350.

suggestion that 8.51/52 represents the Johannine equivalent of the Markan statement.[44] Even so, however, it must be admitted that the saying in John fails spectacularly at points to resemble Mark's text. The 'some standing here' in Mark, signifying Jesus' own generation, is supplanted with a reference to keeping Jesus' word, all mention of the coming of the kingdom has been dropped, and the death 'tasted' is not physical but spiritual, as indicated by the Johannine εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα in 8.52 after θάνατος (cf. also v. 51).[45] In other words, if John 8.51/52 is indeed a version of Mk 9.1, this is Mk 9.1 with its teeth drawn, that is, with its problematic time-frame removed.

The question begged by these differences is, of course, whether Mk 9.1, or something like it, is actually in the background here at all. Not all commentators accept this view by any means.[46] Moreover, it is open to the criticism that if the verbal links between the two texts boil down to two ἀμήν openings and a shared Semitism—which itself is not exclusive to the New Testament nor even to these particular sayings within it[47]—this hardly constitutes evidence in favour of equivalence. Despite these objections, however, there is still evidence of a sort to be had. This comes in the form of Jn 21.21-23, a passage which can plausibly be interpreted as indicating that the logion reproduced at

44. See esp. Lindars, *Behind the Fourth Gospel*, p. 45; E. Haenchen, *A Commentary on the Gospel of John* (2 vols.; trans. R.W. Funk; Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), II, p. 32; Barrett, *Gospel*, p. 350, who also refers to Jn 5.24 in this connection.

45. *Pace* Lindars (*Gospel*, pp. 332-33), εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα here does not replace the reference to the kingdom in the Markan logion but is a Johannine gloss specifying in what sense θάνατος is to be understood. For the Johannine meaning, cf. esp. the references to 'the second death' in Rev. 2.11; 20.6, 14; 21.8.

46. For example, Beasley-Murray dismisses the suggestion as 'needless and quite implausible' (*John*, p. 137).

47. Outside the Gospels, the expression 'to taste death' occurs at Heb. 2.9. For other references, Christian and non-Christian, see Bernard, *Gospel*, II, p. 318; G.H.R. Horsley, *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity* (5 vols.; Macquarie University: Ancient History Documentary Research Centre, 1981–83, 1987, 1989), III, p. 107; IV, pp. 40-41; also A.L. Moore, *The Parousia in the New Testament* (NovTSup, 13; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1966), p. 127. The expression is also found in the opening words of the *Gospel of Thomas*: 'Whoever finds the explanation of these words will not taste death' *Gos. Thom.* log. 1. However, this text may represent an adaptation of Jn 8.52, see J.A. Fitzmyer, *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1971), p. 370.

Mk 9.1 was well known in Johannine circles, well enough known, in fact, to cause problems.

Having dealt glowingly with Peter's fate as martyr in 21.18-19, John now steers the dialogue between Peter and Jesus towards another's fate, that of the beloved disciple (vv. 20-23). As he does so, the atmosphere of the text cools noticeably. Peter's enquiry in v. 21 merits the starchy response (v. 22) that if it is Jesus' will that the beloved disciple remain until his return, that is none of Peter's business (τί πρὸς σέ;); instead, Peter must attend to his own calling (note the emphatic σύ here, cf. v. 19). By v. 23, we begin to see why Peter's interest in the beloved disciple's fate has been made less than welcome. Here John reports that Jesus' words have been the basis of a rumour among 'the brethren' to the effect that the beloved disciple would not die. Meanwhile, John himself is adamant that Jesus said no such thing.

This is an intriguing passage which undoubtedly reflects an actual situation within the community at the time of writing. Reading between the lines in v. 23, it seems reasonable to conclude that the beloved disciple has either recently died or is at death's door,[48] and that this circumstance has badly shaken the community ('the brethren'). The cause of the difficulty evidently concerns Jesus' words, ἐὰν αὐτὸν θέλω μένειν ἕως ἔρχομαι, (τί πρὸς σέ;), first recorded by John in v. 22, and understood to apply to the beloved disciple. Taken at face value, these words can scarcely mean anything else but that the beloved disciple would remain (i.e. remain alive) until Jesus' return at the parousia (ἕως ἔρχομαι).[49] Indeed, John's report of the content of the rumour in v. 23a shows that this is precisely what they have been taken to mean among 'the brethren'. Moreover, the fact that John has not sought to reword this dictum to his advantage when he returns to it at v. 23c could well suggest that it was too well known and firmly entrenched in community lore to be tampered with.[50] At once, the real

48. There is some variation of opinion on this among commentators but the majority view is that the beloved disciple is already dead; see the discussions in Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, III, p. 371; Beasley-Murray, *John*, p. 412; Brown, *Gospel*, II, pp. 1118-19.

49. So Bultmann, *Gospel*, p. 715; Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, III, pp. 369, 370; Barrett, *Gospel*, p. 586; see also E. Malatesta, *Interiority and Covenant: A Study of* εἶναι ἐν and μένειν ἐν *in the First Letter of Saint John* (AnBib, 69; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978), p. 28 with n. 69.

50. See Brown, *Gospel*, II, p. 1118.

nature of the difficulty becomes apparent. It is not the fact of the beloved disciple's death in itself, although no doubt that loss would have its effects. Rather, it is the widely held conviction within the group that the beloved disciple was to survive until the parousia *because Jesus himself had said that he would.* The blow to faith is not difficult to imagine. There they are: *sans* beloved disciple, *sans* parousia, and with that a long-cherished 'word of the Lord' discredited by events.[51] The next step is not too difficult to foresee: 'If Jesus was mistaken in this, what price the rest?' Moreover if, as I have suggested, this chapter was addressed to the community when it was under threat of severe persecution, it is not inconceivable that the question 'What price Christianity?' had already found voice in some quarters. In any event, it is certain that the situation is a serious one. Potentially, it strikes at the heart of the community's *raison d'être*, the Christian gospel itself. As such, it severely threatens the group's stability and, if left unchecked, its future existence.

The evangelist's response in vv. 22-23 suggests that this estimate of the realities of the situation at the time may not be far from the truth. Basically, he gives every impression of being determined on damage containment rather than discussion. In v. 22, the rebuff to Peter, only recently promoted hero of the moment because of his martyr's fate, looks deliberately designed to stifle speculation about the beloved disciple and to refocus energies on day-to-day discipleship.[52] This dismissive tone persists in v. 23. Without ceremony, the rumour noised among the 'the brethren' in v. 23a is flatly contradicted: Jesus did *not* say that the beloved disciple was not to die. Thereafter, no further comment prolongs the issue, and verse and topic both close with the wooden reaffirmation of Jesus' actual words in 23c. Despite the summary treatment, however, it is worth noting that there is enough of the evangelist's response here to betray something important about his

51. See especially Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, III, p. 371.

52. If this is correct, then it means that Peter is representative of the community here, just as he is at 6.68-69. For John, Peter is the martyr type and, like all the other types represented by his characters, Peter can be drawn into the limelight when appropriate. On this showing, John does not appear to pursue the anti-Petrine policy that some scholars attribute to him. For references, see Quast, *Peter and the Beloved Disciple*, pp. 8-13. More recently, see M.D. Goulder, 'John 1,1–2,12 and the Synoptics', in A. Denaux (ed.), *John and the Synoptics* (BETL, 101; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), pp. 201-237, esp. pp. 202-204.

own approach to the reported logion. In denying the content of the rumour, in fact, he has by the same token denied that Jesus' words were intended to be understood in their plain sense. In the absence of further information, one is simply left to conjecture that 'to remain' until the parousia on the one hand and physically to die on the other are not incompatible in his view.[53]

I pointed out earlier that this passage could plausibly be interpreted with reference to the logion in Mk 9.1. In fact, it is a well-supported view that the origin of the prediction which here attaches to the beloved disciple rests in a knowledge of some more general statement of the kind, and that Mk 9.1 is the obvious candidate.[54] Indeed, this makes excellent sense of what we have seen in John's text. It accounts for the fact that the beloved disciple prediction is evidently common knowledge and the signs that there is a certain fixed and traditional quality to it. It also accounts for the actual content of the prediction. In fact, it is not at all difficult to see how a known logion, whose most obvious meaning is that Jesus expects the kingdom to come within the lifespan of his own generation, can have become specific through time to some long-lived member of John's group. This could also mean that the beloved disciple was popularly understood, in Johannine circles at least, to be the last of the original disciples to remain alive.[55] In that case, it must be supposed that hopes among 'the brethren' of an imminent parousia had burned with a peculiar intensity during his declining years only to be dashed by his death. If so, then what has actually been at stake here is much more than the credibility of a specific pronouncement about an individual; what has hung on the beloved disciple's life has been the veracity of Jesus' whole position on the timing of the eschaton. A serious situation indeed, and one capable of eroding the very fabric of John's already beleaguered community. Small wonder that he cracks down hard on speculation about the beloved disciple's fate, and that his judgment on the meaning of the prediction is abrupt and non-negotiable! In sum, what John appears to be tackling here is a particularly telling symptom of the knowledge and

53. See esp. Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, III, p. 371. Schnackenburg is not alone in suggesting that the 'remaining' here could be a reference to the beloved disciple's continuing influence in the Johannine church; see Hoskyns, *Gospel*, p. 559.

54. See, e.g., Barrett, *Gospel*, p. 587; Brown, *Gospel*, II, p. 1118 (=Mt. 16.28); Bultmann, *Gospel*, p. 716 n. 2; Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, III, p. 370.

55. See esp. Beasley-Murray, *John*, pp. 411-12.

influence of the Mk 9.1 logion within his community.

Our purpose in appealing to this passage has been to locate evidence in favour of the proposal that Jn 8.51/52 constitutes an equivalent to the logion at Mk 9.1. Assuming that we have correctly captured the implications of the text in chapter 21, then its value as an ally in this cause can scarcely be in doubt. The relevant points are these. First, the passage in chapter 21 attests a community problem over Jesus' prediction about the beloved disciple, which is itself a specification of the logion found in Mark's text. Such an application strongly suggests that this logion was not only known to Johannine Christians but that it also had a firm place in the community's own tradition. This significantly increases the chances that John will have reproduced it directly in his text at some point. Second, given his evident rejection of the plain meaning of the beloved disciple prediction in 21.23, it is unlikely that he will have reproduced the logion with all its controversial features intact. He is much more likely to go for an interpreted and generally 'corrected' version, preferably with a leaning towards the non-literal. In this connection, note the lack of the problematic time-frame in 8.51/52 by contrast with the Markan text, and also, for that matter, by contrast with the ἕως ἔρχομαι in the prediction in 21.22, 23. Note also how associating εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα with θάνατος neatly evades the literal connotation of exemption from physical death. By this means, continuation *beyond* the grave in some sense is undoubtedly implied—the same sense, one presumes, in which John can affirm in 21.23 that the beloved disciple will 'remain' and yet die. One final comparison deserves our attention. In 8.52 'the Jews' object to Jesus' words on the grounds that Abraham and the prophets died, and so find confirmation of their earlier charge of madness (v. 48). Never fully grasping Jesus' meaning at the best of times, here they are seen to misunderstand completely. Their objection shows that they have taken Jesus' words literally, and so they assume that his promise of life is disproved by the fact of physical death.[56] Compare now John's own 'correction' of the rumour in 21.23: Jesus did *not* say that the beloved disciple would not die. Thus, the evangelist's attitude is the same in both cases: bluntly negated in chapter 21 and pilloried on the lips of 'the Jews' in

56. See Lindars, *Behind the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 45-46; *idem*, *Gospel*, p. 333; Culpepper, *Anatomy*, p. 157; Beasley-Murray, *John*, p. 137; Barrett, *Gospel*, p. 350; Bernard, *Gospel*, II, p. 318; Brown, *Gospel*, I, p. 359; Hoskyns, *Gospel*, p. 346; Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, II, pp. 219-20.

chapter 8 is the assumption that Jesus promised the faithful continued life this side of the grave. The point is this: if John's policy towards the beloved disciple specification of the logion in chapter 21 is the same as towards the meaning of Jesus' words in 8.51/52, the conclusion that 8.51/52 represents some version of the logion itself is surely difficult to resist.

On this basis, it seems reasonable to claim that John's οὐ μὴ γεύσηται θανάτου in 8.52 is no coincidence and that the logion featured at 8.51/52 is indeed a version of that reproduced at Mk 9.1. In establishing this, we have at the same time completed our search for the Synoptic counterpart to Jn 5.24, which is even more 'johannized' in style than 8.51/52, but nevertheless a true tradition-variant (see above). Before we return to chapter 5, however, some remarks on the circumstances which our recent investigation has brought to light will perhaps not come amiss.

In the process of this analysis, we seem to have caught the Johannine community at an interesting stage in its development. On the one hand, there is the evidence from 21.22-23 which suggests that the logion Mark knew and took up into his text at 9.1[57] was familiar also in Johannine circles, where it had become personalized to the beloved disciple and was taken literally among 'the brethren' as a promise of survival until the eschaton. On the other hand, however, there is also evidence to show that the evangelist himself was of a different opinion entirely as to the actual meaning of Jesus' words. According to him, Jesus' promise did not rule out the fact of physical death (21.23; cf. 8.52a) and, meanwhile, he has reproduced as authentic tradition a version of the logion which is not only consistent with his view but which is also so heavily recast that it is scarcely recognizable from its Markan counterpart (8.51/52; cf. 5.24). Moreover, to judge from the further fact that 1 John's later witness to the tradition clearly favours the evangelist's position as expressed at 5.24 (1 Jn 3.14), then it may be presumed that this 'new look'[58] Mk 9.1 was eventually to win the

57. There is a general consensus that the logion is pre-Markan, although no such harmony exists over issues of authenticity and interpretation; see M. Künzi, *Das Naherwartungslogion Markus 9, 1 par: Geschichte seiner Auslegung* (Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Exegese, 21; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1977), esp. pp. 193-96.

58. See esp. Schnackenburg's comment that 21.23 must be judged 'an intentional correction of an older tradition' (*Gospel*, III, p. 370).

day and take its place in the Johannine tradition as standard.

It seems, then, that the Synoptic evangelists were not alone in attempting to curb this logion's potential for subverting the early Christian status quo.[59] Nevertheless, while Mark was content to let context do the work for him,[60] and Matthew and Luke to tinker round the edges, John's version is drastically altered, with all temporal markers erased, and the whole transformed from a prediction of prolonged life for some of Jesus' followers in his own generation into a promise of eternal life for all of Jesus' followers in any generation. Indeed, so extensive is the reworking in this case that it is tempting to suggest that there must have been some prior justification for it, something suitably authoritative, perhaps, which was also part of what was known at the time.

It is difficult to know how far to press this suggestion, not least because to do so would plunge us inappropriately into the usual uncertainties over the precise range of material to which John had access, includeing, of course, the vexed question of whether or not he wrote with one or more of the Synoptics to hand. Nevertheless, there is one observation about the Johannine adaptation of this logion which is perhaps worth mentioning in that connection. This is the fact that it is perfectly possible to 'improve' the logion in Johannine terms, includeing substituting a reference to those who hear/keep Jesus' word for the logion's 'some standing here' (so Jn 8.51, 52; 5.24; 1 Jn 3.11/2.7), by interpreting it with reference to the context *Mark himself* has given it. On this basis, those who receive the promise of not tasting death in 9.1 must also be the faithful who are *not* ashamed of Jesus and his words (cf. 8.38) but who hear him (9.7).[61] It follows that such people will *not*

59. Some would say that little has changed since then. See esp. Maurice Casey's remarks headed 'Tradition, Scholarship and Truth' in which he scythes through modern interpretations of Mk 9.1; 13.30 etc. which, he claims, function 'to ward off anything too uncomfortable' (P.M. Casey, *From Jewish Prophet to Gentile God: The Origins and Development of New Testament Christology* [Cambridge: James Clark; Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991], pp. 170-74 [171]).

60. For an excellent account of how the Markan setting serves to reinterpret the meaning of the logion, see E. Nardoni, 'A Redactional Interpretation of Mark 9.1', *CBQ* 43 (1981), pp. 365-84.

61. Note that both the juxtaposition of 8.38 and 9.1 and the instruction to hear Jesus in 9.7 can be attributed to Markan redaction, see Nardoni, 'Mark 9.1', esp. p. 382; E. Best, *Following Jesus: Discipleship in the Gospel of Mark* (JSNTSup, 4; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981), pp. 44-45, 56-57.

be shunned but rewarded by the Son of man when he comes in glory at the eschaton (cf. 8.38), and so they will never taste death *ever* (οὐ μὴ γεύσηται θανάτου εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, Jn 8.52). Could it be that by the time the fourth Gospel came to be written, some at least in that community—perhaps the 'we' faction of tradition bearers and policy makers—had already gained sight of the canonical Mark, had seen the point of the context and had gratefully taken the hint?[62] This is surely not impossible, especially in the light of other evidence which suggests that John himself could well have been acquainted with Mark's text.[63] Even so, however, it is beyond the scope of this investigation to enter the lists in the 'John and the Synoptics' debate.[64] My present task is to return to our study of Jn 5.24-29 and its role in the making of the Lazarus story.

John 5.24-29: Tradition and Interpretation

My search to identify traditional material in the passage in John 5 has entailed an extensive tour of related texts. This being the case, it is

62. If so, it seems that they were not the only ones to do so: Matthew's version of the logion (16.28) has every appearance of a conflation of Mk 8.38 and 9.1. See further, E. Schweizer, *The Good News According to Matthew* (trans. D.E. Green; London: SPCK, 1976), p. 347; F.W. Beare, *The Gospel According to Matthew: A Commentary* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1981), p. 360. Further on this point, I note with interest that Ashton compares Mk 8.38 favourably with Jn 5.24 in eschatological terms, remarking that John's own concentration of all positive response to Jesus into the act of faith 'is not without precedent' (*Understanding*, p. 224). In fact, there is more than a touch of 'realization' about the Markan verse in that it deals with future judgment which is determined by response to Jesus in the present; see E. Schweizer, *The Good News According to Mark* (trans. D.H. Madvig; Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1970), p. 178.

63. Among commentators, Barrett is notable in having continued to maintain and elaborate his view that John knew either Mark or something else so much like Mark that it made little difference (see *Gospel*, pp. 42-54, esp. p. 45), a position which now has growing support in the continuing debate (see n. 64 below). Even Lindars, staunch supporter to the last of John's independence of the Synoptic tradition, allowed that he must at least have *seen* Mark (*Behind the Fourth Gospel*, p. 12).

64. This continues to flourish; see D. Moody Smith, *Johannine Christianity: Essays on its Setting, Sources, and Theology* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1987), pp. 95-172; *idem*, *John among the Gospels* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992); see also F. Neirynck's comprehensive survey article 'John and the Synoptics 1975–1990', in A. Denaux (ed.), *John and the Synoptics* (BETL, 101; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), pp. 3-62.

perhaps best at this point briefly to summarize the argument so far before proceeding.

In default of any obvious Synoptic parallel my first port of call was 1 John. This proved to be a key move, the results of which effectively dictated the course of the remaining investigation. Close analysis of the epistle writer's argument revealed points of agreement with the Gospel which confirmed that Jn 5.24 contained tradition comprising a reference to hearing Jesus' word and an assurance of the believer's present transfer from death to life. This being established, it was a straightforward matter to identify 8.51 as a sister text reflecting the same tradition, and so to arrive at the repeat in v. 52 and the suggestion that this could be the Johannine equivalent of the logion at Mk 9.1. Confirmation of that took me to 21.21-23 to find evidence of a community in disarray with a prediction about the beloved disciple, generally seen as a specification of the logion, at the heart of the problem. The evangelist's attitude to the specification pointed to 8.51/52 as the logion itself, now heavily modified to suit. And so, by way of a brief conjecture that such modification may not have been entirely innocent of the canonical Mark, back to base in chapter 5.

Thus, if my argument so far has been plausible, I am in a position to claim not only to have isolated tradition in Jn 5.24 but also to have identified it as a thoroughly 'johannized' version of the logion at Mk 9.1 and parallels. Having reached this stage, it should now be possible to describe the composition of 5.24-29 as a whole, taking the tradition in v. 24 as its starting point. Thereafter, I will move on to the Lazarus story itself and attempt to define and demonstrate the precise nature of the influence of this 'source-material' on John's account there.

I begin with 5.24-29. Taken as a whole, this passage consists of a statement containing tradition (v. 24) which is followed by an exposition of that statement (vv. 25-29), interpreting it in future eschatological terms and with reference to themes earlier in the discourse. There now follows a detailed description of this process, beginning with some remarks on context.

By 5.23, John has completed the first stage in Jesus' lengthy defence of his earlier claim to work as God works on the Sabbath (v. 17) in the light of the objection posed by 'the Jews' (v. 18). Essentially his argument is that since Jesus acts only in utter obedience to the will and power of the Father (vv. 19-20), he can justly claim to perform God's

Sabbath work of life-giving and judging (vv. 21-22), and so is properly due the honour due to God, not as equal in the sense of a rival (cf. v. 18), but as God's agent fully empowered by the Sender (v. 23).[65] At this point, John turns to consider the eschatological implications of these claims (vv. 24-29). As he does so, however, it is important to recall that this is not the first time in the Gospel that John has referred to life-giving and judging in relation to Jesus. On the contrary, these twin effects of Jesus' presence in the world have been dramatically set forth in 3.16-21 in terms anticipatory of the finality of the eschaton. In what follows, John will not only take this earlier argument to its natural conclusion but will also include some of its expressions in his new text.

Intent now on the eschatological effects of Jesus' capacity to give life and to judge, John signals a fresh turn in the discourse in v. 24 with a second double ἀμήν formula (cf. v. 19) and a shift from third person to first.[66] This change strikes a note of intimacy which is entirely appropriate, for in this verse and the next John will deal exclusively with the fortunes of those who believe in Jesus.

To judge from my earlier findings on tradition in v. 24, it appears that the verse as a whole represents an adroit combination of two types of material. On the one hand, as we have seen, the opening and closing sections reflect the substance of a Jesus logion as known also to the author of 1 John. On the other hand, however, sandwiched between the two is another section which looks like the fruits of editorial activity on John's part, designed not only to set the logion in context but also to recall the teaching in 3.16-21. Thus, the initial reference to the believer as one who hears Jesus' word, which is based in tradition, has been skilfully extended to become a twofold description,[67] which is then followed by an assurance of eternal life. Note how the τῷ πέμψαντί

65. On the principle of agency, see P. Borgen, 'God's Agent in the Fourth Gospel', in J. Neusner (ed.), *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough* (SHR, 14; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1968), pp. 137-48. On Jesus' divine claims in this and other texts and their background within Judaism's 'alternative theology', see Ashton, *Understanding*, pp. 137-51.

66. So Bultmann, *Gospel*, p. 257. *Pace* Lindars who prefers to paragraph v. 24 in with vv. 19-23 on the understanding that the ἀμήν opening in v. 24 is occasioned by a brief reference to the tradition already underlying the previous verse (*Gospel*, pp. 223-24; *idem*, 'Traditions', p. 97 n. 34).

67. See Barrett, *Gospel*, p. 261: 'The absence of a second article shows that the two participles are co-ordinate features of a single, twofold, description'.

με ('the one who sent me') here neatly picks up on τὸν πατέρα τὸν πέμψαντα αὐτόν ('the Father who sent him') in the previous verse[68] while, at the same time, it reaffirms the idea of the Son as *sent*, a key concept in the argument in 3.16-21 (cf. v. 17).[69] Note also how the words, [ὁ] πιστεύων ... ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον, while certainly in tune with Jesus' claim in v. 21, are virtually lifted from 3.16 and related texts.[70] The remainder of the verse takes the form of an explanatory extension[71] which serves to specify precisely what it means to have ζωὴ αἰώνιος as a present possession. Typically, this is first presented negatively:[72] it means not to come into judgment (εἰς κρίσιν οὐκ ἔρχεται). Once again the reference keys into a claim earlier in the discourse (cf. v. 22) but is unmistakably linked to the passage in chapter 3 (cf. οὐ κρίνεται, v. 18).[73] Finally the positive aspect is specified, at which point the tradition-based assurance of the believer's present transfer from death to life comes in to close the sentence. This verse, founded as it is in tradition, and now complete with introductory formula, twofold subject and expanded predicate, is the foundation for the entire pericope (see Fig. 1 opposite).

68. *Pace* Lindars, the phrase τῷ πέμψαντί με is not the reason for the ἀμήν opening to v. 24 (see above, n. 66). Its presence here is probably for reasons of continuity as well as in deference to earlier material.

69. In Johannine usage, there seems to be no difference in meaning between the verbs ἀποστέλλειν (cf. 3.17) and πέμπειν, only differences in tense and mood; see C.C. Tarelli, 'Johannine Synonyms', *JTS* 47 (1946), pp. 175-77 (175).

70. Jn 3.16b is anticipated in 3.15 and repeated in 3.36. This is not to imply that this added material cannot itself be tradition-based. Indeed, to judge from the striking parallels between 3.16-17 and 1 Jn 4.9-10, it almost certainly is. Schnackenburg, e.g., is not slow to identify 5.24 as an adaptation of the same kerygmatic material he discerns at 3.16 and later in the chapter (*Gospel*, II, p. 108). The point here is simply that 5.24 has been completed with material, whatever its provenance, which comes immediately from elsewhere in John's text.

71. For this function of καί, see BAGD, p. 393.

72. Lindars compares 5.24 with 3.16 in this respect; see 'Δικαιοσύνη in Jn 16.8 and 10', in Tuckett (ed.), *Essays*, pp. 21-31 (29).

73. So Bultmann, *Gospel*, p. 257 n. 4; Barrett, *Gospel*, p. 261.

Figure 1. *John 5.24-29*

Verse 24	*Verse 25*	(*vv. 26-27*	*Verses 28-29*
Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι	ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ἔρχεται ὥρα καὶ νῦν ἐστιν ὅτε	Jesus gives life, and judges as	(μὴ θαυμάζετε τοῦτο, ὅτι) ἔρχεται ὥρα ἐν ᾗ
ὁ τὸν λόγον μου ἀκούων καὶ πιστεύων τῷ πέμψαντί με	οἱ νεκροὶ ἀκούσουσιν τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ	υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου [cf. vv. 21-22].)	πάντες οἱ ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις ἀκούσουσιν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκπορεύσονται
ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον καὶ εἰς κρίσιν οὐκ ἔρχεται, ἀλλὰ μεταβέβηκεν ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου εἰς τὴν ζωήν.	καὶ οἱ ἀκούσαντες ζήσουσιν.		οἱ τὰ ἀγαθὰ ποιήσαντες εἰς ἀνάστασιν ζωῆς, οἱ δὲ τὰ φαῦλα πράξαντες εἰς ἀνάστασιν κρίσεως.

Verse 25 expounds the promise in v. 24 by projecting it into the eschatological future. Accordingly, while, on the one hand, this verse echoes the language and structure of its predecessor—a feature of John's text, incidentally, which is properly designed to strike the ear, rather than the eye of modern silent study[74]—on the other, it also translates its message into familiar last-day imagery.[75] Thus, after the

74. It is a point often overlooked that the Gospels were designed primarily for oral performance; see esp. G.N. Stanton's remarks in *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1992), pp. 73-76. On the general question of oral/aural culture and the biblical text, see W.J. Ong, *The Presence of the Word: Some Prolegomena for Cultural and Religious History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967), esp. pp. 179-91; *idem*, *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word* (New Accents; London: Methuen, 1982), esp. pp. 74-75. See also Ong's contribution, 'Text as Interpretation: Mark and After', to *Semeia* 39 (1987), pp. 7-26, and esp. Bartholomew's 'Feed my Lambs' on Jn 21. Among commentators, Pheme Perkins is especially alert to this issue; see *The Johannine Epistles* (New Testament Message, 21; Dublin: Veritas, 1979), pp. xviii-xix. Perkins's approach gives direction to a detailed analysis of 1 John as a piece of oral rhetoric in D.F. Watson, 'Amplification Techniques in 1 John: The Interaction of Rhetorical Style and Invention', *JSNT* 51 (1993), pp. 99-123.

75. Compare esp. the Qumran 'Messianic Apocalypse' (4Q521) which predicts that the heavens and the earth will hear God's Messiah in the context of an explicit

opening formula, which is strictly imitative of v. 24,[76] a reference to the 'hour' is introduced which brings into play a new time-element. Here the ἔρχεται ὥρα establishes the future orientation of the verse as a whole, while the parenthetical καὶ νῦν ἐστιν[77] fixes its application to the believer's present status as described in v. 24. This link having been secured, the rest of the verse runs predictably enough. It follows that οἱ νεκροί must then be understood as the *faithful* dead, that is, those who heard Jesus ' word in life, who have eternal life (v. 24), are also those who, on hearing his call at the eschaton, will be quickened (cf. v. 21).[78] Similarly, the title 'Son of God', whose occurrence in this

reference to raising the dead. For an English translation of the relevant fragment (2), see G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 4th rev. edn, 1995), pp. 244-45. All fragments are translated and fully discussed in E. Puech, 'Une apocalypse messianique (*4Q521*)', *RevQ* 15 (1991–92), pp. 475-519, esp. p. 493 where Puech explicitly mentions Jn 5.21, 25 in relation to the resurrection reference in frag. 2. Puech has since published a comprehensive two-volume study in which 4Q521 is central to a reconsideration of biblical and post-biblical texts commonly associated with resurrection and the after-life (*La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: Immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle? Histoire d'une croyance dans le Judaïsme Ancien* [2 vols.; EBib, NS 21-22; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1993]; see the review by G.J. Brooke in L.L. Grabbe [ed.], *The Society for Old Testament Study Book List 1994* [Leeds: Maney, 1994], p. 114). Further on the contemporary belief in resurrection, see F. García Martínez's remarks on 4QpsDan ar in *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran* (STDJ, 9; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1992), pp. 146-47. García Martínez also cites 1QH 4.29-34, but this is a misreference: the first 4 should be a 6. For the Hymns text, see M. Mansoor (trans.), *The Thanksgiving Hymns* (STDJ, 3; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1961), p. 87. Note also that this belief is enshrined in the *Eighteen Benedictions*: 'Blessed art thou, O Lord, who makest alive the dead' (*NIDNTT*, II, p. 865).

76. *Pace* Lindars, 5.25 does not begin a new section and no new logion comes into play. In fact, the weakness of Lindars's position is immediately obvious in that, having committed himself to the view that a Jesus-saying is represented in this verse, he is then unable to identify one (*Gospel*, p. 224; *idem*, 'Traditions', p. 97 n. 34).

77. This phrase is missing from some witnesses but is generally assumed to be an authentic part of the text, see Lindars, *Gospel*, p. 224; Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, II, p. 465 n. 72.

78. Thus, οἱ νεκροί here cannot be taken to mean those who are dead *spiritually*, *pace* Barrett, *Gospel*, p. 262; Brown, *Gospel*, I, pp. 215, 219; Beasley-Murray, *John*, pp. 76-77; Bernard, *Gospel*, I, pp. 242-43; Bultmann, *Gospel*, p. 259; Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, II, p. 111. Lindars is surely correct in stressing the future orientation of the entire section (*Gospel*, p. 224).

verse has not gone unchallenged,[79] is perfectly consistent with the emphasis on belief in *God* as sender of the Son (τῷ πέμψαντί με) in v. 24 and, in any case, could well have already been in John's mind from 3.18, which is where it last appears.

Verses 26 and 27 function essentially to recall vv. 21-23, and so to reaffirm Jesus' God-given authority to give life and to judge in this future eschatological context. Note in v. 26 the return to the Father and Son language which characterizes the argument in vv. 19-23, and how the opening words of this verse exactly duplicate those in v. 21.[80] At v. 27, the theme of judgment, central to 3.16-21, and presented in this discourse as a function delegated to the Son (v. 22) but negated in the believer's case (v. 24), arrives back in the argument. It is here that Jesus is identified as 'Son of man'. It is important not to miss the fact that John's phrase here is anarthrous. This is rare in the New Testament and unique in the Gospels,[81] and telling evidence that he has in mind the judgment scene from the book of Daniel where 'one like a son of man' (ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, 7.13)[82] is given glory and everlasting dominion.[83] With the reality of future judgment now firmly in place, the stage is set for a full and final description of events at the last day.

Scarcely pausing to hint at the greater marvels yet to be described

79. Lindars conjectures that the text here originally read simply 'the Son' so that 'of God' represents a very early gloss ('The Son of Man in the Johannine Christology', in Tuckett (ed.), *Essays*, pp. 33-50 [41]).

80. In fact, ὥσπερ never appears in the Gospel outside these two references. The return to the Father and Son language in v. 26 is noted by Lindars ('The Son of Man in the Johannine Christology', p. 41).

81. Elsewhere only at Heb. 2.6 (quoting Ps. 8.4); Rev. 1.13; 14.14.

82. So Theodotion, but the LXX also has the phrase. The texts are conveniently set out by F.J. Moloney in *The Johannine Son of Man* (Biblioteca di Scienze Religiose, 14; Rom: Libreria Ateneo Salesiano, 1976), p. 81.

83. The origin of John's phrase in 5.27 is usually traced to the Daniel text; see, e.g., Moloney, *Son of Man*, p. 81; Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, II, p. 113; Carson, *Gospel*, p. 257; esp. the discussions in Lindars, *Gospel*, p. 226; *idem*, 'The Son of Man in the Theology of John', in Tuckett (ed.), *Essays*, pp. 153-66 (163-64). In view of my earlier remarks on a possible link with the canonical Mark, it is perhaps not irrelevant to note here that Mark himself has already linked the Jesus logion at 9.1 (cf. Jn 5.24) with the text of Dan. 7.13-14 (Mk 8.38). On this, see J. Marcus, *The Way of the Lord: Christological Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992), pp. 86-87, 164-67.

(cf. v. 20), John now launches into an apocalyptic scene not unworthy of the author of Revelation (vv. 28-29). This differs from v. 25, not in terms of future orientation but in terms of scale, for this is the general resurrection of the dead. As such, it is at once the goal and the climax of this section of the discourse, the ultimate implication of Jesus' earlier claims to function both as life-giver and judge (vv. 21-22). Notice how the pattern established at v. 24 has been carefully retained here while, at the same time, the imagery in v. 25 has been taken up and elaborated. As a result, John's scene in vv. 28-29 emerges not only as a variant of v. 25 but also, given that v. 25 already represents an exposition of v. 24 in apocalyptic terms (see above), ranks as another version of that exposition, this time with universal application. It is probably this distinction in scope, rather than any desire to present these verses as more unequivocally future-orientated, that has prompted John to drop the parenthetical καὶ νῦν ἐστιν in v. 25 at this stage.[84] As we have remarked, the future scene in v. 25 refers to believers only. As such, it applies strictly to the promise in v. 24 that the faithful already possess eternal life and are not subject to adverse judgment, and John's parenthesis expresses that link. Once v. 25 is expanded to the comprehensive picture in vv. 28-29, however, the same can hardly be said: the focus here is not on 'the dead', faithful in life, who will live (v. 25) but on '*all* [πάντες] who are in the tombs', faithful and unfaithful alike, who will come forth, some to condemnation. This brings us to the matching pair of judgment alternatives which completes the scene (v. 29). Here it is plain that the book of Daniel, already evidently in John's mind in v. 27, has again influenced his text. This time the allusion is to the picture of resurrection in 12.2 where we learn that many will awake, 'some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt'.[85] It is equally plain, however, that John's own

84. *Pace* Barrett, *Gospel*, p. 263; Brown, *Gospel*, I, p. 220; Carson, *Gospel*, p. 256.

85. So Barrett, *Gospel*, p. 263; Bernard, *Gospel*, I, p. 245; Brown, *Gospel*, I, p. 220; Lindars, *Gospel*, p. 226; Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, II, p. 117. Note that John envisages that 'all' (πάντες) will rise rather than 'many' as in the Daniel text (πολλοί in both Greek versions, translating רבים). However, he is not unique in so doing; see, e.g., *T. Benj.* 10.8: τότε καὶ πάντες ἀναστήσονται, οἱ μὲν εἰς δόξαν, οἱ δὲ εἰς ἀτιμίαν (corruption of the text not suspected); also 1QH 6.29, 34 which has '*all* the sons of truth will awake' (see Vermes, *Dead Sea Scrolls*; Mansoor, *Hymns*, p. 87, esp. p. 88 n. 1, emphasis mine), although in this case the phrase 'sons

earlier composition at 3.16-21, never far from his thoughts throughout this piece, has also left its mark here. The reference to good and evil deeds is undoubtedly indebted to it (3.19-21). In fact, John is prepared to be even more precise. Just in case his audience have not yet quite grasped that response to Jesus in this life is the criterion which absolutely determines one's destiny on judgment day, John drops in the phrase φαῦλα πράσσειν, which is taken directly from 3.20 where it refers to those who shun the light and are condemned already, and is repeated only here in the entire Gospel. This brings the point home nicely.

On this analysis, Jn 5.24-29 emerges as a single, coherent piece of composition which fits logically into the larger context of the discourse as a whole. It is founded in tradition, and has taken final shape through a process of expanding and expounding that tradition. This process has involved using other material already to hand, either from Christianity's Jewish heritage or from completed work earlier in the Gospel. The end result is a pericope on eschatology where present and future have been drawn together into a distinctively Johannine presentation. At this point, we may usefully pause to reflect that this passage is a notorious *crux interpretum* for commentators, that it has been explicated in a variety of different ways, and that this is not one of them. To put this another way, if the above description is at all feasible, then it means that John's text is intelligible just as it is. It is therefore not the conglomerate of mismatched materials it is frequently held to be, and so does not require to be explained either by dividing it up differently or by drafting in theories of redactors, ecclesiastical or otherwise.[86] In

of truth' restricts the promise to the faithful. On the inclusive meaning of רבים, see J. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (trans. A. Ehrhardt; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), pp. 123-25, 148-50. For a full discussion of the variety of applications, from the particular to the universal, see the excursus 'Allgemeine oder teilweise Auferstehung der Toten?', in H.L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* (5 vols.; Munich: C.H. Beck, 1956–61), IV.2, pp. 1166-98.

86. It was Bultmann who famously proposed that futurist passages such as Jn 5.28-29 were not original to the Gospel but were interpolations by an ecclesiastical redactor who sought to conform the dangerous radicalism of the evangelist's thought with traditional eschatology (see *Gospel*, pp. 11, 238, 261-62; *idem*, 'The Eschatology of the Gospel of John', in *idem*, *Faith and Understanding* [ed. R.W. Funk; trans. L.P. Smith; London: SCM Press, 1969], pp. 165-83). Although not all aspects of Bultmann's argument have proved durable, the concept of a final redactor

sum, on this showing there is nothing, at either the structural or theological level, to prevent us from regarding this passage as a unit of composition for which John himself was entirely responsible.

I come, finally, to the question of the involvement of 5.24-29 in the Lazarus story, and thus to return to the issue which sparked off this investigation. At that earlier point, it was argued that the affinity between these two sections of the Gospel was so marked that any adequate description of John's methods in chapter 11 would need to take account of that link and define it as precisely as possible. It is now time to attempt such a definition. I suggest that the link between this discourse material and the narrative in chapter 11 did not come about by any random or coincidental means. Rather, it was consciously forged by John himself at the point when he composed the Lazarus account because it suited his requirements at the time to do so. The circumstances may be described as follows.

By the time the Lazarus episode was added to the Gospel, John had become convinced that the situation between his community and an increasingly hostile Judaism was about to turn uglier still. As a result, this story finds him bent on encouragement and reassurance for his beleaguered flock now under threat of persecution. He needs to inspire them to stand firm in their faith so that they will remain undaunted and, if need be, will face the prospect of martyrdom undismayed. Indeed, we have already seen him at work pressing home the point in 11.7-16 that to lay down one's life in imitation of Jesus is truly to fulfil the Christian calling. However, as John knows well, death is not the end of the matter for the true believer. Beyond it there lies the utter assurance, grounded in the fact of Jesus' own resurrection, that those who are faithful to him in life will be raised by him to eternal life at the end of

who was not the evangelist continues to be influential. Brown, e.g., assigns 5.26-30 to a redactor who was sympathetic to the evangelist's approach (*Gospel*, I, pp. xxxvi-xxxix, 219-21). Similarly, Schnackenburg takes the view that 5.28-29, although added by a redactor, was not beyond the boundaries of John's own thought (*Gospel*, II, pp. 114-17, 430-35). The difficulty here is, of course, that the more sympathetically the redactor is presented the more the question is begged, 'Why not the evangelist himself?' On this showing, Lindars is correct in rejecting all attempts to assign any part of this passage to an interpolator (*Gospel*, p. 221; *idem*, *John*, p. 71). For a full discussion of the range of redaction-critical proposals on this passage including an analysis of 5.21-30 treated as a whole, see Moloney, *Son of Man*, pp. 72-80.

the age. As John retails the miracle story of Jesus bringing Lazarus back to life, he fully intends to illustrate that truth spectacularly. Accordingly, he returns to 5.24-29 which not only enshrines the Jesus logion he wants, promising that the faithful no longer belong in death's realm, but which also already interprets it in future eschatological terms. He then proceeds to compose his story in chapter 11 with that passage directly in view, concentrating now purely on its positive aspects.[87] In other words, I suggest not only that the link between discourse and narrative was created by John himself, but also that it consists in the fact that the Lazarus story was produced as a second exposition of the tradition in 5.24, picking up on the positive elements in the first, and expressing the whole through the medium of narrative. This investigation will now conclude with the evidence from chapter 11 in support of this case.

The Tradition on Life in the Lazarus Story

I turn first to the programmatic 11.4 in which Jesus announces, for the benefit of John's readers, what Lazarus's illness is all about.[88] In my previous chapter, I recognized the force of the reference at the end of the statement to the glorification of the Son of God. This time, however, my attention is claimed by the enigmatic declaration at the beginning that Lazarus's illness οὐκ ἔστιν πρὸς θάνατον ('is not unto death'). The construction πρὸς θάνατον is unusual and its only other occurrence in the New Testament is in the text of 1 John.[89] I will begin with the epistle writer's argument.

1 John 5.16-17 finds the author embarked on an affirmation of the power of Christian prayer (vv. 14-15), in which connection he raises the issue of sin and forgiveness. In v. 16, he declares that God's pardon for the sinner can be successfully petitioned where the sin committed is not πρὸς θάνατον, adding darkly that there is such a thing as sin πρὸς θάνατον, but that he does not advise prayer in that case. In v. 17, he insists that all unrighteousness is sin, and then reaffirms that there is sin which is not πρὸς θάνατον.[90] Here, as often, 1 John's text is the

87. See Dodd, *Interpretation*, p. 364.

88. So Bultmann, *Gospel*, p. 397 n. 5. Beasley-Murray describes 11.4 as 'an extended title of the story of Lazarus and the key to its meaning' (*John*, p. 188).

89. See esp. Bernard, *Gospel*, II, p. 374.

90. Unlike the evangelist, 1 John also uses the negative particle μή with πρὸς

very triumph of obscurity. Precisely on what basis he distinguishes the two types of sin, why he thinks that only the one can be successfully prayed for and, in particular, what stunning logic prompts him to move on in v. 18 to reassert his earlier claim to Christian impeccability (cf. 3.9) are all puzzles not easy to solve. Nevertheless, for our purposes, there is one point about 1 John's use of πρὸς θάνατον which seems clear enough. Since he uses the phrase consistently in relation to ἁμαρτία, there can be little doubt that his θάνατος, to which sin does or does not tend, refers to death of the spirit and is not intended in any physical sense.

Even this meagre certainty, however, seems difficult to arrive at in the evangelist's case. In Jn 11.4, what is declared not πρὸς θάνατον is Lazarus's illness, a condition which, unlike 1 John's ἁμαρτία, is only too physical. Thus, at this point, the plain sense of Jesus' words is that the illness is not fatal.[91] Yet once we get into the narrative, nothing could be further from the truth. We soon learn that Jesus is aware that Lazarus is dead (vv. 13-14) and, indeed, by the time Jesus reaches Bethany, John will have ensured that Lazarus is as dead as can be (v. 17; cf. v. 39). Evidently, then, the denial that the illness is πρὸς θάνατον in v. 4 is not quite what it seems at first. As the narrative unfolds, it becomes clear that John does not perceive this description as incompatible with the fact of physical death; despite appearances, it does not mean that Lazarus will not die.

If this last statement has a familiar ring to it, I suggest that this much is only to be expected. As far as John is concerned, Jesus' words in 11.4 do not mean that Lazarus will not die, any more than his promise in 8.51, 52 could be disproved by the deaths of Abraham and the prophets, or the specification of that promise to the beloved disciple in 21.22-23 was disproved by the death of that particular disciple. In other words, John's οὐκ ἔστιν πρὸς θάνατον here, as a description of what

θάνατον (cf. v. 16). However, there is no apparent difference in meaning (so Brown, *Epistles*, p. 611).

91. So J. Marsh, *The Gospel of St John* (Pelican Gospel Commentaries; Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1968), p. 421; see also Bernard, *Gospel*, II, p. 374; Lindars, *Gospel*, p. 387. Surprisingly few commentators pause to clarify this point, most preferring to launch immediately into Johannine profundities. Haenchen's remark that 'the illness is not of the absolutely fatal kind - yet Lazarus will sink very deeply into the shades of death before Jesus raises him' amounts to a meaningless compromise (Haenchen, *Gospel*, II, p. 56).

Lazarus's illness signifies, properly belongs in the context of the Jesus logion reflected in his text at 8.51, 52 and 5.24; it is ultimately intended to be understood in the same sense as Jesus' earlier assurances that the faithful, whom Lazarus here represents, will never see or taste death, which is to say that they have passed out of death into life. A final glance at the text of 1 John is perhaps not irrelevant at this point. Amidst the opacity there, one feature stands out about the sin which he describes as μὴ or οὐ πρὸς θάνατον, and that is the fact that he attributes it to a 'brother' (5.16). Thus, the sinner 'not unto death' is a fellow member of the community, one of the faithful, who can be prayed for and given life. It is surely no accident that, according to the tradition 1 John has in common with the evangelist at 3.14, such a person is also one of those whose transfer out of spiritual death is already assured.[92]

Of course, for all our careful analysis, it is difficult to imagine that the full import of that fleeting phrase at the beginning of Jn 11.4 could have struck even the sharpest among the evangelist's flock on first hearing. But then John is far too skilled a tactician to suppose that it would. For now, his 'not unto death' is little more than a signal, the briefest digest of his subject-matter to be going on with. What he actually means by it, positively as well as negatively, will gradually be disclosed in the course of the narrative. Before we move on, however, there is one other small point about the content of this verse which deserves a mention because it is probably a tell-tale sign of the direction of John's thoughts at the time. Earlier, I referred in passing to the end of the statement, in which Jesus speaks of the glorification of the Son of God. In fact, this is one of only three occasions in the Gospel where Jesus refers to himself using this title. The one previous to this is at 10.36, but there the term has been prompted by a citation from scripture.[93] The only other occurrence is at 5.25.[94] I suggest that this is not coincidence; rather, it has happened because the tradition in

92. The link between 1 Jn 3.14 and 5.16-17 is recognized by Whitacre (*Johannine Polemic*, pp. 137-40). As a result, Whitacre prefers to interpret the 'sin unto death' as secession from the community.

93. So Brown, *Gospel*, I, p. 423. John's argument in 10.34-36 can be appreciated only when the remainder of Ps. 82.6 (cf. 10.34), including the phrase 'sons of the Most High', is taken into account.

94. This parallel is noted by Schnackenberg (*Gospel*, II, p. 514) and Brown (*Gospel*, I, p. 423).

5.24 and its accompanying exegesis have been playing over in John's mind, at least from the start of the verse if not before, and the title has simply suggested itself from the previous passage as he has gone on to complete the statement.

We next hear tidings of Lazarus's fate at v. 11. At this point, having already exhorted the disciples to accompany him into danger, Jesus tells them that Lazarus, his friend and theirs, has fallen asleep (κεκοίμηται), and he is going to Bethany to awaken him (ἵνα ἐξυπνίσω αὐτόν). As John's next three verses painfully seek to clarify, Jesus' reference to sleep is not to be taken literally but as a euphemism for death. In fact, the euphemism itself is by no means unusual: at that time it was already a familiar stock-in-trade not only within Judaism but also in the ancient world at large.[95] Moreover, there are other examples of it in the New Testament. Note especially how the same sleep reference, this time using καθεύδειν, appears on Jesus' lips in the Synoptic account of the raising of Jairus's daughter (Mt. 9.24; Mk 5.39; Lk. 8.52), and how Matthew in particular seems as anxious as John that it not be misunderstood (cf. Mt. 9.18). The most instructive parallels, however, come from the Pauline corpus. These show that the euphemism was much favoured in early Christian circles as a means of referring to the death of believers, those who, as Paul puts it, 'have fallen asleep in Christ' (1 Cor. 15.18).[96] Indeed, this preference is hardly surprising: it aptly expressed the belief that death for loyal Christians was an impermanent state, merely an interval of waiting until the parousia when they would be awakened by Jesus to life.[97] Placed in this context, Jesus' reference to waking the sleeping Lazarus in Jn 11.11 acquires its full and final significance. As a euphemism, it is not simply an early hint that Jesus purposes to return the dead Lazarus alive to his family; it is also a pointer to the deeper truth that the faithful dead, whom Lazarus represents, will be raised by Jesus to eternal life at the eschaton.

Taken in this more profound sense, Jesus' comment on Lazarus in 11.11 proves to be thematically linked with his earlier assurances—in the logion reflected at 5.24 and 8.51, 52—that those who faithfully

95. So Bernard, *Gospel*, II, p. 378; see further, Horsley, *New Documents*, III, p. 93.

96. Other examples include 1 Cor. 7.39; 11.30; 15.6, 20, 51; Eph. 5.14; 1 Thess. 4. 13-16; 2 Pet. 3.4. For later references in Christian literature, see Barrett, *Gospel*, p. 392.

97. See esp. 1 Cor. 15.20, 23; Eph. 5.14; 1 Thess. 1.10; 4.16.

keep his word in life are already removed from the realm of spiritual death. Indeed, we are immediately reminded of the future-orientated expression of that logion in 5.25 which specifies that, at the eschaton, the faithful dead will hear the voice of the Son of God (cf. 11.4) and live. For our purposes, moreover, this description of Lazarus's status can also be used to help clarify the evangelist's thinking in the case of the specification of the same logion to the beloved disciple in 21.21-23. That passage, we recall, saw him in contention with 'the brethren' over the meaning of Jesus' statement that the beloved disciple would 'remain' until his return. While it was clear from the reported rumour in v. 23 that community members had taken this to mean that the beloved disciple would remain *alive* until Jesus' return at the parousia, it was not at all clear from the evangelist's response at that point, beyond flat denial of that interpretation, what his own thinking was or how he himself might have glossed Jesus' words. However, by appealing to the description of the dead Lazarus he has placed on Jesus' lips at 11.11, the matter can be resolved. Using this analogy, it becomes possible to represent John's position in chapter 21 as follows: Jesus did not mean that the beloved disciple would remain *alive* until the parousia; Jesus meant that the beloved disciple would remain *asleep in death* until the parousia,[98] in the sure hope that he, who supremely represents the Johannine faithful, would be awakened by Jesus to eternal life.

So far, evidence has been presented to show that the euphemism in 11.11 relates to the logion at 5.24 and parallels purely in terms of theme. Verbally the two are not linked. Indeed, 11.11-13 is the only point in the entire Gospel where the imagery of sleeping and waking occurs. Despite this, however, I believe it is possible to claim that a verbal link does exist, although it is indirect in that it is mediated through a third text.

In my earlier analysis of 5.24-29, it was observed that, at points, John's text had demonstrated the influence of the book of Daniel. Not only was there the anarthrous Son of man reference in v. 27, which cued us in to Dan. 7.13, but there was also the picture of resurrection in v. 29, the positive and negative aspects of which clearly linked it to the scene in Dan. 12.2 with its two judgment alternatives. However, this does not exhaust the content of the Daniel 12 verse. The first part,

98. *Pace* Schnackenburg *et al.* See above, n. 53.

which leads into the judgment detail, runs as follows: 'And many of those who sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake'. Here, then, in the scripture which has already influenced part of his exegesis of the logion at 5.24, is precisely the euphemistic imagery that John has drawn into his text at 11.11. In other words, it could be argued that Jesus' description of Lazarus here constitutes a second allusion to Dan. 12.2 where 5.29 was the first. I suggest that this has come about because John has composed the Lazarus episode with 5.24-29 in mind and, in this case, has found in its scriptural backdrop the language he needs to lighten this otherwise sombre stage in his narrative with a glimpse of the glory to come.

We move on now to the exchange between Jesus and Martha on the road to Bethany (11.21-27). This is the pedagogical high point of John's narrative in which the significance of the miracle to follow is carefully and memorably set forth for the benefit of the reader. Here, parallels with the discourse in chapter 5 are well in evidence and commentators have not been slow to document them.[99] These parallels exist, not simply because both passages feature the same theme, but because John has actually drawn the key points of the dialogue in chapter 11 directly from the earlier text. To be precise, the material he has used is both contained and recalled in 5.24-29.

When Jesus and Martha meet outside Bethany, the conversation quickly turns to the subject of resurrection. In 11.23, Jesus assures Martha that her brother will rise again. In v. 24, Martha assents to this, certain in the knowledge (οἶδα)[100] that Lazarus will indeed rise 'at the last day'. The actual phrase ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ is a speciality of the Gospel, which otherwise features prominently in the 'bread of life' discourse in chapter 6 (vv. 39, 40, 44, 54; cf. 12.48).[101] Its presence there is hardly surprising: chapter 6 is almost certainly another late

99. Beasley-Murray calls 5.21-29 'the background of 11.25-26' (*John*, p. 191). See further Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, II, p. 330; Lindars, *Gospel*, p. 395; Barrett, *Gospel*, pp. 395-96; Brown, *Gospel*, II, p. 434; Carson, *Gospel*, pp. 412-13. Bultmann suggests that 11.25-26 is 'a fragment of the discourse used in 5.19ff'. (*Gospel*, p. 402 n. 3). See also Culpepper, *Anatomy*, p. 141.

100. Martha's οἶδα here implies something taken for granted, in this case resurrection at the end of the age. The same certainty informs the statement by the man born blind (οἴδαμεν) that God does not listen to sinners (9.31) and, likewise, the author of 1 John does not pause to defend the case (οἴδατε) that no murderer can have eternal life (1 Jn 3.15).

101. See Ruckstuhl, *Einheit*, p. 299.

addition to the Gospel which shows strong signs of the same themes and preoccupations as chapter 11.[102] Meanwhile, it is certain that the substance of Martha's eschatological conviction about her brother in 11.24, which is thoroughly Jewish,[103] serves to key into the subject-matter of 5.24-29. In the light of what follows this is entirely appropriate.

Jesus' reply in 11.25-26 begins with a characteristic 'I am' saying: ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἀνάστασις καὶ ἡ ζωή ('I am the resurrection and the life'). Dodd points out that the order 'resurrection...life' here is the reverse of what we find in the earlier passages 5.24-29; 6.54, taking this as evidence in support of the Lazarus story's emphasis on resurrection.[104] Within its own terms, Dodd's argument is perfectly valid, and few would dispute his point about emphasis. Nevertheless, his 'reversal' thesis ultimately does not work because it fails to take account of all the available data. What Dodd has overlooked is the fact that in 5.21 Jesus claims not only to give life but also that, in doing so, he acts in utter imitation of the Father who ἐγείρει τοὺς νεκροὺς καὶ ζῳοποιεῖ ('raises the dead and gives life'). Here is precisely the subject-order of the 'I am' saying in 11.25 and, almost certainly, the text from which it has been derived.[105] As I observed earlier, this text is deliberately recalled by John at 5.26.

The remainder of Jesus' revelation to Martha takes the form of a carefully constructed word-play in which life and death are not only contrasted with one another but are also themselves understood in contrasting ways. This is designed to explicate the predicate of the

102. On chapter 6 as a late addition to the Gospel, see esp. Lindars, *Gospel*, pp. 50, 234; *idem*, *John*, p. 39. The frequency of the promises of resurrection and eternal life in this chapter (cf. 6.39, 40, 44, 47, 50, 51, 54, 57, 58, 63) together with the martyr figure's confession at the end (6.68-69) strongly suggest a background of real or impending persecution (see above, Chapter 1 n. 18). It is possible that 12.44-50 is also late; see Brown, *Gospel*, I, pp. xxxvii, 490.

103. So Lindars, *Gospel*, pp. 394-95. Among other texts, Lindars refers to Dan. 12.2 and Jn 5.28-29 in this connection.

104. Dodd, *Interpretation*, p. 365.

105. Barrett also compares the expression ἀνάστασιν ζωῆς in 5.29 (*Gospel*, p. 395). These parallels lend support to the argument that the omission of καὶ ἡ ζωή from 11.25 in some witnesses is accidental (see esp. Beasley-Murray, *John*, p. 183 n. g; also Bultmann, *Gospel*, p. 403 n. 2; Lindars, *Gospel*, p. 395; also B.M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2nd edn, 1994), p. 199.

'I am' saying in terms of its significance for the believer. Accordingly, the first part of the statement, ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ κἂν ἀποθάνῃ ζήσεται ('Those who believe in me, even though they die, will live') (v. 25), looks to the future and to resurrection beyond physical death, while the second part, καὶ πᾶς ὁ ζῶν καὶ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ οὐ μὴ ἀποθάνῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ('and everyone who lives and believes in me will never die') (v. 26), concerns the present and possession now through faith of the life which is eternal.[106] Note how the line in v. 25 effectively restates the message of 5.25, namely, that the dead (οἱ νεκροί) who believe (cf. 5.24) and who hear Jesus' voice will live (ζήσουσιν). Note also how the second line is entirely to the point of the tradition-based 5.24, perhaps even to the extent that it also opens with a single, twofold description. Beyond that, however, it can scarcely be claimed that 11.26 resembles the earlier text in construction. Nevertheless, in this case we are not obliged to confine our attention to the material in chapter 5; as we discovered earlier, the same tradition has been rendered in equivalent terms by John at 8.51/52. Compare now his οὐ μὴ ἀποθάνῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ('will never die') in 11.26 with the earlier θάνατον οὐ μὴ θεωρήσῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ('will never see death') (8.51) and οὐ μὴ γεύσηται θανάτου εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ('will never taste death') (8.52) and the indebtedness, in substance as well as form, is unmistakable.[107] To this extent, then, it is not unreasonable to claim that John has contrived to introduce a reference to the tradition itself into this part of the Lazarus story. It remains only to add here that by now the real meaning of Jesus' declaration in v. 4 that Lazarus's illness οὐκ ἔστιν πρὸς θάνατον has been thoroughly unpacked.

Finally, we come to the miracle itself, so to conclude this investigation at the point where it began. By this stage in the narrative, John

106. Thus, πᾶς ὁ ζῶν in v. 26 refers to those who are alive in the physical sense (so Bultmann, *Gospel*, p. 403 n. 6; Dodd, *Interpretation*, p. 364). To interpret the reference spiritually is to miss the essence of the word-play (*pace* Beasley-Murray, *John*, p. 191; Brown, *Gospel*, I, p. 425; Carson, *Gospel*, p. 413; also C.F.D. Moule, 'The Meaning of "Life" in the Gospel and Epistles of St John: A Study in the Story of Lazarus, John 11.1-44', *Theology* 78 [1975], pp. 114-25 [120]). The effect is captured well by Stibbe (*John's Gospel*, p. 93).

107. These texts are linked by Barrett (*Gospel*, p. 350), Beasley-Murray (*John*, p. 137), Bultmann (*Gospel*, p. 324 n. 5) and Carson (*Gospel*, p. 413), all of whom also refer to 5.24. On the construction οὐ μὴ (subjunctive) εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα in John, see Barrett, *Gospel*, p. 396; Ruckstuhl, *Einheit*, p. 297.

has ensured that his readers are carefully schooled, not only in the enormity of Jesus' personal sacrifice for Lazarus and its implications,[108] but also in the knowledge that those who believe in Jesus now are guaranteed resurrection to life by him at the end of the age (vv. 25-26). All that now remains is to proceed to the description of the actual event in which Jesus brings Lazarus back to life. When it happens, however, this miracle will not be just a revivification; in John's hands it will become a little model of the eschaton.

Immediately before the miracle takes place, John shows Jesus at prayer (vv. 41-42). The prayer itself (to be considered in detail in the next chapter) is not a petition but an expression of thanks. As Jesus explains (v. 42), this has been spoken for the sake of the bystanders so that they may believe that he has been sent by the Father (ἵνα πιστεύσωσιν ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας).[109] The thought of Jesus as sent by God is Johannine Christology in essence. As God's agent sent into the world (3.17; 10.36; 17.18), Jesus as John portrays him has no independent existence; rather, he operates only in accordance with God's will, seeking God's glory and not his own (4.34; 5.30; 6.38; 7.18; cf. 5.44). As a result, he is transparent of God (12.45; cf. 1.18; 14.9), his words are God's words (3.34; 7.16; 12.49; 14.24) and his works are the works of God (5.36; 8.16; 9.4). Seen from this perspective, John's reminder of Jesus' mission in 11.42, coming at the point where he is about to perform the Lazarus miracle, is a predictable enough move. Nevertheless, the fact that the miracle in this case is an act of life-giving, added to the fact that Jesus' capacity to perform such acts as the emissary of the Father has already been definitively argued by John in the discourse beginning at 5.19, make it highly likely that he has drawn this particular reference into the Lazarus story out of deference to the earlier passage (cf. 5.23, 24).[110]

Given the length of the story as a whole, the miracle itself is told with a remarkable economy of words. Already present at the open tomb (vv. 38, 41), Jesus turns from prayer to call Lazarus to come forth (v. 43) and Lazarus duly emerges, graveclothes and all (v. 44). Even in such a short space, however, the content of 5.24-29 has not failed to

108. As dealt with above in Chapter 2.

109. For the same formula, see 17.8, 21, 23, 25.

110. Barrett makes much of the discourse in chapter 5 in this connection (*Gospels*, p. 403).

make its mark. Note especially the promise in 5.25 that the faithful dead will hear Jesus' voice and live and also the general picture in 5.28-29, where we learn that all in the tombs will hear his voice and come forth, some to the resurrection of life.[111] In other words, the detail of John's miracle in chapter 11 is pat to these earlier texts; too pat, in fact, not to have been taken directly from them.[112] On this basis, we must surely conclude that the raising of Lazarus, as John has rendered it, has been deliberately conformed to the eschatological scenario as presented in the passage in chapter 5, by which means he has caused it to become a σημεῖον of resurrection to life at the last day.

It is in this latter connection that John's description of Jesus' voice (φωνή, cf. 5.25, 28; 10.3, 4, 16, 27) as a φωνὴ μεγάλη in 11.43 makes best sense. In the Synoptics, the same phrase is used to describe Jesus' anguished cries from the cross (Mt 27.46, 50 par.) and, on that account, John's reference in chapter 11 is sometimes interpreted in a Passion context.[113] Nevertheless, it is not at all clear that this is what John himself intended, not least because, in his own record of the crucifixion scene, Jesus is never seen to raise his voice. In fact, John's φωνὴ μεγάλη comes from the apocalyptic tradition and, as such, belongs together with other New Testament passages which depict Jesus' return at the eschaton in terms of loud trumpet-calls and mighty voices (1 Thess. 4.16; cf. Mt. 24.31).[114] In other words, when in 11.43 John tells us that Jesus calls Lazarus from the tomb with a powerful voice, it

111. The parallels are set out in detail by Dodd (*Interpretation*, p. 365) and Brown (*Gospel*, p. 437). Beasley-Murray comments, 'We are reminded of 5.25, 28-29; the raising of Lazarus is a sign authenticating the truth of those utterances and of the revelation given in vv. 24-25' (*John*, p. 195).

112. In fact, these parallels offer the strongest support for the authenticity of 5.28-29. Not to recognize this link (Bultmann, *Gospel*, p. 395 n. 4, attributes 11.43-44 to John's signs-source) or to resort simply to generalities on the apocalyptic tradition (Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, II, p. 340) does not do justice to the evidence. Brown, although mistaken in my view, is at least consistent in assigning *both* 5.28-29 and the Lazarus story to the hand of a redactor (cf. *Gospel*, I, pp. xxxvii, 219).

113. See F. Kermode, 'John', in R. Alter and F. Kermode (eds.), *The Literary Guide to the Bible* (London: Fontana Press, 1987), pp. 440-66 (pp. 456-57); also Stibbe, *John's Gospel*, p. 87.

114. So Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, II, p. 340; see also Bernard, *Gospel*, II, p. 400. See further, B. Lindars, 'The Sound of the Trumpet: Paul and Eschatology', *BJRL* 67 (1984–85), pp. 766-82.

is not simply to convey the impression of rousing Lazarus from sleep (v. 11);[115] by implication, this is the great triumphant cry of the Son of man[116] which literally wakes the dead on judgment day.

115. This connection is made by Lindars (*Gospel*, p. 402).

116. The closest parallel here is undoubtedly Rev. 1.10 where the voice of the glorified Son of man is described as a φωνὴ μεγάλη ὡς σάλπιγγος (cf. also the φωνὴ μεγάλη at 21.3). Note also that this inaugural vision is plainly indebted to the book of Daniel, including, as at Jn 5.27, an anarthrous υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου reference (Rev. 1.13). (The Old Testament background to Rev. 1.13-16 is conveniently set out in S. Moyise, *The Old Testament in the Book of Revelation* [JSNTSup, 115; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995], pp. 37-39.) On the significance of the loud voice in early Christian literature, including reference to Jn 11.43 and Revelation, see R. Strelan, 'Recognizing the Gods (Acts 14.8-10)', *NTS* 46 (2000), pp. 488-503 (499).

Chapter 4

JESUS' PRAYER*

In 11.41-42, John has Jesus pause for prayer before raising Lazarus. In itself, this is not entirely surprising: chapter 9 has already contained a strong hint that Jesus had prayed successfully before curing the man born blind (9.31)[1] and, in fact, that miracle is only recently referred to in the Lazarus story itself (11.37). What calls for comment, however, is the actual wording of the prayer. Thus, although John's reference in v. 41 to Jesus lifting up his eyes is a clear signal that what follows is to be understood in a prayer context,[2] the declaration, πάτερ, εὐχαριστῶ σοι ὅτι ἤκουσάς μου. ἐγὼ δὲ ἤδειν ὅτι πάντοτέ μου ἀκούεις ('Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me. I knew that thou hearest me always'), is not a petition at all; rather, it is a confident acknowledgment that on this occasion, as always, Jesus has the ear of God. Needless to say, this representation of Jesus at prayer has given rise to some considerable discussion among commentators. Broadly speaking, the range of opinion falls into three main categories as follows.

First, there is the suggestion that the prayer is a complete artifice, a hollow gesture whose sole purpose is to impress the bystanders. Loisy's phrase, 'prière pour la galerie' ('prayer to the gallery') is to the point here, as is also Holtzmann's report of the prayer dubbed by some as a *Scheingebet* ('sham prayer') or *Schaugebet* ('show prayer').[3] Among

* An adapted version of this chapter appears in W.E. Sproston North, 'Jesus' Prayer in John 11', in S. Moyise (ed.), *The Old Testament in the New Testament* (Festschrift J.L. North; JSNTSup, 189; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), pp. 164-80.

1. See Lindars, *Gospel*, p. 400.

2. So, e.g., Barrett, *Gospel*, p. 402; Brown, *Gospel*, I, pp. 427, 436; Bernard, *Gospel*, II, p. 397.

3. See A. Loisy, *Le quatrième évangile* (Paris: Alphonse Picard et Fils, 1903), p. 651; H.J. Holtzmann, *Evangelium, Briefe und Offenbarung des Johannes* (Hand-

modern commentators, Lindars inclines most to this view. Strictly speaking, he argues, the prayer is unnecessary, but is included specifically for the crowd, who must understand the miracle in terms of 'the communion between Jesus and the Father'.[4] In general, however, the suggestion of a 'pretence prayer' is largely dismissed today on the grounds that this is no bid for self-aggrandizement on Jesus' part, but a demonstration of the Son's dependence on the Father which ensures that the miracle is for the glory of God (cf. vv. 4, 40).[5]

A second response is to assume that Jesus' thanks for having been heard presupposes not only that a petition has been made but also that the moment of request can be pinpointed by sifting through the story so far. Accordingly, while suggestions vary, Jesus' inner turmoil and distress at v. 33 proves the most popular option.[6] The problem here is, of course, that John has specified no actual moment of petition, which means that any proposal of this kind is forced to rely purely on conjecture. As for the suggestion that the petition was offered at v. 33, this ignores the fact that the story itself makes clear that Jesus knew he would raise Lazarus as early as v. 11.[7]

The third approach, which is widely held, interprets the prayer as a demonstration of the Son's perfect unity with the Father, which is such that Jesus' petitions are always granted without their needing utterance. This is Bultmann's position,[8] and it is worth quoting a sample of his

Commentar zum Neuen Testament, 4; Freiburg: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1891), p. 139. Bultmann quotes Wrede and Heitmüller to this effect (*Gospel*, p. 409 n. 1). See also the references in M.-J. Lagrange, *Évangile selon Saint Jean* (EBib; Paris: J. Gabalda, 5th edn, 1936), pp. 307-308; and Hoskyns, *Gospel*, p. 406.

4. Lindars, *Gospel*, pp. 401-402.

5. See, e.g., Barrett, *Gospel*, pp. 402-403; Brown, *Gospel*, I, pp. 436-37; Carson, *Gospel*, p. 418; Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, II, p. 339.

6. Bernard, e.g., assumes that the aorist ἤκουσάς in v. 41 indicates some definite act of prayer, perhaps before v. 4 (*Gospel*, II, p. 397). For the suggestion that the prayer was offered during the agony v. 33, see Lagrange, *Évangile*, p. 308; Barrett, *Gospel*, p. 402; J.N. Sanders, *A Commentary on the Gospel According to St John* (ed. B.A. Mastin; London: A. & C. Black, 1968), p. 275; also J.E. Davey, *The Jesus of St. John: Historical and Christological Studies in the Fourth Gospel* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1958), p. 126.

7. As Carson correctly remarks, v. 11 'assumes that the raising of Lazarus had been determined for some time' (*Gospel*, p. 418).

8. *Pace* A.T. Hanson, who misrepresents Bultmann as claiming that Jesus only pretends to pray (*The Prophetic Gospel: A Study of John and the Old Testament*

argument. The prayer, he writes, 'is the request of one who stands in perfect unity with the Father', and he continues,

> if he knows that the Father constantly hears him (πάντοτέ μου ἀκούεις), it is implied by that he [*sic*], the Son, never steps out of the attitude of the asker...he does not need to make prayer requests like others, who have to rouse themselves out of their attitude of prayerlessness and therefore godlessness; for he continually stands before God as the asker and therefore as the receiver.[9]

In fact, such is Bultmann's towering influence even yet that this theme continues, usually with minimal variation, to inform the work of most commentators on this passage up to the present time. The following remarks are representative: 'Jesus is in constant communion with his Father, who always "hears" even the unspoken thoughts of his heart' (Barrett); '...the Johannine Jesus is always praying, for he and the Father are one' (Brown); '...because the Son lives completely in union with the Father, ...his prayer is always sure of being heard' (Schnackenburg); 'The second clause of the prayer, ...implies a perpetual union with the Father, on the basis of which his continuing prayers are ever heard and therefore granted' (Beasley-Murray).[10]

There is much to be said in favour of this third argument. On the one hand, it fits in well with evidence elsewhere in the Gospel for Jesus' utter dependence on and unity with the Father, and, on the other, it makes it possible to maintain the view that Jesus really prays while also accounting for the fact that no petition is recorded earlier in the narrative. The real difficulty in this case, however, concerns the interpretation of that second clause: ἐγὼ δὲ ᾔδειν ὅτι πάντοτέ μου ἀκούεις (v. 42). Bultmann has evidently understood πάντοτε here to mean 'constantly',[11] and has moved logically from the idea of constant

[Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1991], p. 154). Unfortunately, this is by no means the only error in Hanson's survey of opinion on Jesus' prayers in John (pp. 153-55).

9. Bultmann, *Gospel*, p. 408.

10. Barrett, *Gospel*, p. 402; Brown, *Gospel*, I, p. 436; Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, II, p. 339; Beasley-Murray, *John*, p. 194. See further, Lindars, *Gospel*, p. 401; Dodd, *Interpretation*, p. 256; H. Van der Loos, *The Miracles of Jesus* (*NovTSup*, 8; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1965), p. 585; and esp. R.H. Fuller, *Interpreting the Miracles* (London: SCM Press, 1963), pp. 107-108. Fuller is quoted approvingly by Beasley-Murray.

11. The German is *ständig*, cf. R. Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes* (Meyers Kommentar, 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962), p. 312.

audience with the Father to that of constant prayer on Jesus' part, and so on to distinguish this as a state of perfection which can only be characteristic of the unique Father–Son relationship. There are two problems with this. First, it is difficult to see why John would have chosen to present his readers with an insight into the Son's unique union with the Father when it must, by definition, exclude themselves. To put this another way, how far can we be certain that purely christological concerns were as much a priority to the fourth evangelist as they evidently are to those who interpret him for today? The second problem is that this interpretation is inconsistent with John's presentation of Jesus at prayer elsewhere in the Gospel. Thus, if the meaning here is that uttered prayer on Jesus' part is always unnecessary, it is noticeable that no such consideration has weighed in the case of the actual prayers John records at 12.27-28 and in chapter 17. Indeed, in the latter instance, John has no hesitation in presenting Jesus petitioning the Father, and doing so at considerable length.

As this brief survey shows, it is no easy matter to arrive at an interpretation of John's meaning in these verses which is satisfactory on all counts. However, if there is one conclusion to be drawn from our discussion so far, it is surely that a strictly christological approach, whether devoted to defending the genuineness of the prayer or to extolling the unique qualities of the Son's union with the Father, is unlikely to prove adequate to the task. At this point, it may be instructive to recall the views of one notable scholar of the pre-Bultmann era, E.C. Hoskyns. Hoskyns maintained that Jesus' prayer in this passage, far from constituting an unattainable ideal, was an exemplification of the certainty of answer characteristic of the prayers of Christians themselves.[12] As we proceed we may well find that Hoskyns's more 'democratic' alternative comes closer to John's purposes as he set about composing this section of the Lazarus story. For the present, however, our enquiry must take us elsewhere in the chapter.

What often goes unnoticed in discussions on this passage is the simple fact that the prayer develops logically out of Martha's confidence, earlier in v. 22, that Jesus can have from God whatever he asks. Thus, if we seek to learn what John is about in 11.41-42, we need to begin, not by appealing to lofty themes and high Christology, but with the faith of Martha from a previous scene in the narrative itself.

12. Hoskyns, *Gospel*, p. 406.

Martha's 'Confession'

By the time Jesus finally arrives at the outskirts of Bethany in v. 17, Lazarus has been dead and in the tomb four days. Martha goes out to meet Jesus and, as Mary will do later, she draws attention to the fact of Jesus' absence during her brother's fatal illness (v. 21, cf. v. 32). Unlike her sister, however, Martha has more to say. In v. 22, she adds καὶ νῦν οἶδα ὅτι ὅσα ἂν αἰτήσῃ τὸν θεὸν δώσει σοι ὁ θεός ('And even now I know that whatever you ask from God, God will give you'). With these words, John is able not only to pick up on the maxim in 9.31 that God hears the prayers of the righteous but also, by narrowing the focus to Jesus himself in this case, to prepare the ground for the form Jesus' own prayer will eventually take. In order to capture the full flavour of what is being implied here, however, we need to know exactly what kind of statement this is. Is it, perhaps, some half-baked hint on Martha's part, an obliquely expressed request for Jesus to return her brother to life? This is often suggested,[13] but the interpretation is unlikely for two reasons. First, it is inconsistent with the behaviour John attributes to Martha later in the story: her horrified response in v. 39 to Jesus' command to open the tomb amply demonstrates that she has so far harboured no thoughts of Lazarus's revival.[14] Second, the form of the statement in v. 22 does not lend itself to subtlety of this kind. There is nothing tentative about Martha's οἶδα ὅτι: it carries all the certainty of an agreed truth. Indeed, its presence here tells us that Martha is as certain about this as she is, two verses later, about the fact that her brother will rise again at the last day, which relies on common assumption.[15] As Bultmann rightly observes, v. 22 'is formulated not as a request but as a confession'.[16] Even so, however, it is difficult to see how the actual substance of the statement can be classed as 'confessional' in the usual Johannine sense. Thus,

13. So Sanders, *Gospel*, p. 268; Lindars, *Gospel*, p. 394; Barrett, *Gospel*, p. 395; Bultmann, *Gospel*, p. 401; Brown, *Gospel*, I, p. 433; Haenchen, *Gospel*, II, p. 61.

14. This point is made by Beasley-Murray (*John*, p. 190), Carson (*Gospel*, p. 412) and Schnackenburg (*Gospel*, II, p. 329).

15. Although a well-known constituent of Pharisaism, belief in resurrection was widely held in Judaism at the time; see Barrett, *Gospel*, p. 395; Beasley-Murray, *John*, p. 190; Brown, *Gospel*, I, p. 434; Lindars, *Gospel*, p, 394; also Grayston, *Gospel*, p. 91. See further, Chapter 3 n. 75 above.

16. Bultmann, *Gospel*, p. 401.

while Martha's confidence in the power of Jesus' prayer is no doubt quite proper to faith, it is scarcely of the same order as, for example, the lofty Christology of the triple title she bestows on Jesus at v. 27, the elements of which are variously reproduced on the lips of the faithful elsewhere in the Gospel.[17] In other words, if, according to John, Martha 'knows' that God always grants Jesus' requests, what is the basis for that certainty in this case? In order to discover something of the background to the statement, I will first consult 1 John on the issue of prayer.

Martha's faith in Jesus as a man mighty in prayer is not reproduced in the Christology of the epistle writer. Nevertheless, on the subject of prayer itself, 1 John is lyrical indeed: he twice refers to it in glowing terms and, on the second occasion, he signals clearly that this is a matter involving the shared knowledge of tradition. I will make this second reference my starting point.

As the epistle draws to its close, 1 John's theme of assurance concentrates on the language of having and knowing.[18] By 5.12, he has already stated that the faithful, those who have God's witness (v. 10), are also those who have life. This last thought is uppermost in his mind as he embarks on the final section.

In 5.13, 1 John announces to his readers that his aim in writing is so that those who believe in the name of God's Son may know that they have eternal life. This verse is often compared with the very similar valedictory formula at Jn 20.31. Nevertheless, the evangelist has nothing to match I John's ἵνα εἰδῆτε here and the confidence that it implies.[19] In fact, confidence or boldness (παρρησία) is 1 John's next topic (5.14). This they all have before God (note the return to the 'we' of joint witness with ἔχομεν) and it is such that if they petition God according to his will he hears them. In v. 15, this privilege is affirmed in the strongest possible terms (οἴδαμεν twice): certainty of a favourable

17. For Jesus as ὁ χριστός, cf. 1.41 (disciples), also 1.20; 3.28 (by default) (John the Baptist); for ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ cf. 1.34 (John the Baptist), 1.49 (Nathanael), cf. 10.36; for ὁ εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἐρχόμενος, cf. 6.14 (the five thousand), also 1.27, 30 (John the Baptist), cf. 1.9. The first two titles are found together, as here, in 20.31.

18. There are eight instances of ἔχειν in 5.10-15 alone, and six of οἶδα in vv. 13-20.

19. See esp. Brown's comments in *Epistles*, p. 634.

hearing[20] carries the equal certainty that they have their requests granted. Having set out the principle, 1 John now turns to apply it in the case of intercessory prayer for an erring brother (vv. 16-17).[21] Precisely what he means here by sin which is and is not πρὸς θάνατον is a difficulty not easy to resolve. Nevertheless, this does not obscure the point of the application, which is that prayer by one of the faithful in such an instance is guaranteed success. Thus, one who sees his brother sinning shall ask, and God will give him life (αἰτήσει καὶ δώσει αὐτῷ ζωήν).[22] With this final assurance on prayer, 1 John's language of asking and being given by God takes us back to Martha's address to Jesus in the very different setting of Jn 11.22: ὅσα ἂν αἰτήσῃ τὸν θεὸν δώσει σοι ὁ θεός ('whatever you ask from God, God will give you').

So far, then, when it comes to what 1 John and his readers 'know' about prayer, and where his diction coincides with that of Martha in the Gospel, the focus is not on Jesus but on the privileged status of those who believe in him. In fact, this position is unaltered from the epistle writer's previous reference to prayer where much the same terminology is used. I will now complete the evidence from the epistle with a brief examination of the earlier passage.

Following an argument on conscience of truly profound obscurity (3.19-20),[23] 1 John turns to the subject of boldness (παρρησία) before God (v. 21, cf. 5.14). As in the later passage, this leads immediately to an assurance of successful prayer (v. 22). The wording is slightly

20. Ἐάν with οἴδαμεν here does not imply a condition but draws a consequence (= 'since'), so R. Schnackenburg, *The Johannine Epistles* (trans. R. Fuller and I. Fuller; New York: Crossroad, 1992), p. 248; Brown, *Epistles*, p. 610. On the use of ἀκούειν with the meaning 'to hear favourably', see I.H. Marshall, *The Epistles of John* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), p. 244; Smalley, *1, 2, 3 John*, p. 295; Brooke, *Epistles*, p. 144.

21. So Dodd, *Epistles*, p. 135; N. Alexander, *The Epistles of John* (Torch Bible Commentaries; London: SCM Press, 1962), pp. 126-27. *Pace* Brown (*Epistles*, p. 635 with n. 14) and Houlden (*Epistles*, p. 102), there is no reason to suppose that 1 John has had intercessory prayer specifically in mind before this point.

22. Despite the awkward shift, the implied subject of δώσει here is almost certainly God and not the petitioner; see Schnackenburg, *Epistles*, p. 249; Marshall, *Epistles*, p. 246 n. 17; Smalley, *1, 2, 3 John*, p. 300; Grayston, *Epistles*, p. 142; see further, the discussion in Brown, *Epistles*, pp. 611-12.

23. See esp. Brown's scathing remarks in *Epistles*, p. 453.

different here but the point is the same. Thus, whereas in 5.14 true prayer was according to God's will, here it holds for those who keep God's commandments and do what pleases him.[24] Similarly, the assurance itself is slightly altered: whereas in 5.14-16 reference was made to asking and being heard or to asking and being given, here the form used is asking and receiving. In 3.23, however, the verbal parallelism resumes with the reference to belief in the name of God's Son (cf. 5.13).

Thus, our initial impression is confirmed: when 1 John speaks of prayer whose answer is certain, he consistently refers it to the confidence of the faithful before God and not, as in Martha's statement, to that of Jesus himself. Strictly speaking, then, as far as he is concerned, the tradition on prayer is about Christianity rather than Christology. If we take this perspective seriously, it suggests that if John and 1 John are linked through tradition in this case, the direct equivalent in the Gospel is not 11.22 but some other text related to it whose orientation is towards discipleship. In fact, it takes the combined witness of both passages in the epistle to identify this key text as a Jesus logion on prayer in the Gospel's final discourse material.[25] The logion appears in its entirety on Jesus' lips in 16.23b-24.

> ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἄν τι αἰτήσητε τὸν πατέρα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου δώσει ὑμῖν. ἕως ἄρτι οὐκ ἠτήσατε οὐδὲν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου· αἰτεῖτε καὶ λήμψεσθε, ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ὑμῶν ᾖ πεπληρωμένη.[26]

Note the double ἀμήν opening, which can serve as a tradition signal, and the combination of αἰτεῖν not only with διδόναι as in 1 Jn 5.16// Jn 11.22 but also with λαμβάνειν as in 1 Jn 3.22. Note also the reference to Jesus' name which is an accompanying feature in both 1 John

24. On the equivalence of these expressions in Johannine thought, see esp. Loader, *Epistles*, pp. 46, 74 and Marshall, *Epistles*, p. 200.

25. Needless to say, e.g. this identification is not lost on commentators on these texts in 1 John. See, e.g., Schnackenburg, *Epistles*, pp. 187, 247-48; Brown, *Epistles*, pp. 460-61, 609, 635; Marshall, *Epistles*, pp. 199-200, 244; Dodd, *Epistles*, pp. 93-94, 134; Loader, *Epistles*, p. 45, cf. p. xxiii, etc. The point here is that the evidence of the two passages together fixes the reference with certainty.

26. 'Truly, truly, I say to you, if you ask anything of the Father, he will give it to you in my name. Hitherto you have asked nothing in my name; ask, and you will receive, that your joy may be full.'

passages.[27] All told, including Jn 11.22, this logion is variously reproduced no fewer than seven times in the Gospel and epistle (see Fig. 2).

Figure 2. *The Tradition in John and 1 John*

John		1 John	
11.22	καὶ νῦν οἶδα ὅτι ὅσα ἂν αἰτήσῃ τὸν θεὸν δώσει σοι ὁ θεός.		
14.13-14	**13** καὶ ὅ τι ἂν αἰτήσητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου τοῦτο ποιήσω, ἵνα δοξασθῇ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν τῷ υἱῷ. **14** ἐάν τι αἰτήσητέ με ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου ἐγὼ ποιήσω.	3.21-23	**21** Ἀγαπητοί, ἐὰν ἡ καρδία [ἡμῶν] μὴ καταγινώσκῃ, παρρησίαν ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν. **22** καὶ ὃ ἐὰν αἰτῶμεν λαμβάνομεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, ὅτι τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ τηροῦμεν καὶ τὰ ἀρεστὰ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ ποιοῦμεν. **23** Καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἐντολὴ αὐτοῦ, ἵνα πιστεύσωμεν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἀγαπῶμεν ἀλλήλους, καθὼς ἔδωκεν ἐντολὴν ἡμῖν.
15.7, 16	**7** ἐὰν μείνητε ἐν ἐμοὶ καὶ τὰ ῥήματά μου ἐν ὑμῖν μείνῃ, ὃ ἐὰν θέλητε αἰτήσασθε, καὶ γενήσεται ὑμῖν. **16** οὐχ ὑμεῖς με ἐξελέξασθε, ἀλλ' ἐγὼ ἐξελεξάμην ὑμᾶς καὶ ἔθηκα ὑμᾶς ἵνα ὑμεῖς ὑπάγητε καὶ καρπὸν φέρητε καὶ ὁ καρπὸς ὑμῶν μένῃ, ἵνα ὅ τι ἂν αἰτήσητε τὸν πατέρα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου δῷ ὑμῖν.	5.13-16	**13** Ταῦτα ἔγραψα ὑμῖν ἵνα εἰδῆτε ὅτι ζωὴν ἔχετε αἰώνιον, τοῖς πιστεύουσιν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ. **14** Καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ παρρησία ἣν ἔχομεν πρὸς αὐτὸν ὅτι ἐάν τι αἰτώμεθα κατὰ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ ἀκούει ἡμῶν. **15** καὶ ἐὰν οἴδαμεν ὅτι ἀκούει ἡμῶν ὃ ἐὰν αἰτώμεθα, οἴδαμεν ὅτι ἔχομεν τὰ αἰτήματα ἃ ᾐτήκαμεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.

27. In fact, 1 John never uses the expression 'in the name of Jesus/God's Son' *except* in connection with this logion (3.23; 5.13). This reinforces the impression that the two are organically linked in the Johannine tradition (cf. also Jn 14.13-14; 15.16; 16.26). It is possible, therefore, that the second appearance of the logion in 1 Jn 5.14-16 has been triggered by the mention of belief in the name of God's Son already in v. 13. If so, then the argument in vv. 14-21 is of a piece with the previous verse and is not to be separated off as a redactor's addition (*pace* Bultmann, *Epistles*, p. 85).

		16 Ἐάν τις ἴδῃ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτάνοντα ἁμαρτίαν μὴ πρὸς θάνατον, αἰτήσει καὶ δώσει αὐτῷ ζωήν, τοῖς ἁμαρτάνουσιν μὴ πρὸς θάνατον. ἔστιν ἁμαρτία πρὸς θάνατον. οὐ περὶ ἐκείνης λέγω ἵνα ἐρωτήσῃ.
16.23-26	**23** ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἄν τι αἰτήσητε τὸν πατέρα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου δώσει ὑμῖν· **24** ἕως ἄρτι οὐκ ἠτήσατε οὐδὲν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου. αἰτεῖτε καὶ λήμψεσθε, ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ὑμῶν ᾖ πεπληρωμένη. **25** Ταῦτα ἐν παροιμίαις λελάληκα ὑμῖν. ἔρχεται ὥρα ὅτε οὐκέτι ἐν παροιμίαις λαλήσω ὑμῖν, ἀλλὰ παρρησίᾳ περὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ἀπαγγελῶ ὑμῖν. **26** ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου αἰτήσεσθε, καὶ οὐ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐρωτήσω τὸν πατέρα περὶ ὑμῶν.	

In this case, the task of identifying New Testament equivalents to the tradition linking John and 1 John is fairly straightforward. This is clearly a version of the well-known 'ask, and it will be given' logion. Perhaps its most famous occurrence is in the Sermon on the Mount as 'Ask, and it will be given you...for everyone who asks receives' where it is part of a triple saying (Mt. 7.7-8//Lk. 11.9-10). However, in one context or another, this logion actually surfaces in all three Synoptics as well as in the epistle of James, and does so in much the same variety of form as in the Johannine texts (see Fig. 3).[28]

28. See further the studies of similarities in pattern and substance between the Johannine and Synoptic references by Dodd (*Historical Tradition*, pp. 349-52) and Brown (*Gospel*, II, pp. 634-35). The striking resemblances between Jn 16.23-24 and Mt. 7.7-8//Lk. 11.9-10 prompt W.D. Davies and D.C. Allison to suggest that the Johannine version may be an adaptation of the tradition from Q (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew* [3 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988–97], I, p. 685). See also Schnackenburg's remark that these parallels are 'another indication of the fact that the Johannine school pre-

Figure 3. *'Ask, and it will be given': New Testament Equivalents*[29]

Mt. 7.7-8	**7** Αἰτεῖτε καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν, ζητεῖτε καὶ εὑρήσετε, κρούετε καὶ ἀνοιγήσεται ὑμῖν. **8** πᾶς γὰρ ὁ αἰτῶν λαμβάνει καὶ ὁ ζητῶν εὑρίσκει καὶ τῷ κρούοντι ἀνοιγήσεται.	Lk. 11.9-10	**9** Κἀγὼ ὑμῖν λέγω, αἰτεῖτε καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν, ζητεῖτε καὶ εὑρήσετε, κρούετε καὶ ἀνοιγήσεται ὑμῖν. **10** πᾶς γὰρ ὁ αἰτῶν λαμβάνει καὶ ὁ ζητῶν εὑρίσκει καὶ τῷ κρούοντι ἀνοιγ[ήσ]εται.
Mt. 18.19-20	**19** Πάλιν [ἀμὴν] λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ἐὰν δύο συμφωνήσωσιν ἐξ ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς περὶ παντὸς πράγματος οὗ ἐὰν αἰτήσωνται, γενήσεται αὐτοῖς παρὰ τοῦ πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς. **20** οὗ γάρ εἰσιν δύο ἢ τρεῖς συνηγμένοι εἰς τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα, ἐκεῖ εἰμι ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν.	Jas 1.5-6	**5** Εἰ δέ τις ὑμῶν λείπεται σοφίας, αἰτείτω παρὰ τοῦ διδόντος θεοῦ πᾶσιν ἁπλῶς καὶ μὴ ὀνειδίζοντος καὶ δοθήσεται αὐτῷ. **6** αἰτείτω δὲ ἐν πίστει μηδὲν διακρινόμενος. ὁ γὰρ διακρινόμενος ἔοικεν κλύδωνι θαλάσσης ἀνεμιζομένῳ καὶ ῥιπιζομένῳ.
Mt. 21.22	**22** καὶ πάντα ὅσα ἂν αἰτήσητε ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ πιστεύοντες λήμψεσθε.		
Mk 11.24	**24** διὰ τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν, πάντα ὅσα προσεύχεσθε καὶ αἰτεῖσθε, πιστεύετε ὅτι ἐλάβετε, καὶ ἔσται ὑμῖν.	Jas 4.2-3	**2** ἐπιθυμεῖτε καὶ οὐκ ἔχετε, φονεύετε καὶ ζηλοῦτε καὶ οὐ δύνασθε ἐπιτυχεῖν, μάχεσθε καὶ πολεμεῖτε, οὐκ ἔχετε διὰ τὸ μὴ αἰτεῖσθαι ὑμᾶς, **3** αἰτεῖτε καὶ οὐ λαμβάνετε διότι κακῶς αἰτεῖσθε ἵνα ἐν ταῖς ἡδοναῖς ὑμῶν δαπανήσητε.

served and gave further consideration to many early traditional statements of Jesus' (*Gospel*, III, p. 160). On the link between the epistle of James and the Q traditions, see P.J. Hartin, *James and the Q Sayings of Jesus* (JSNTSup, 47; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), see esp. pp. 173-79 on asking and prayer. For further references outside the New Testament corpus, see Goldsmith, ' "Ask and it will be Given..." ', p. 254 nn. 2-4; Brown, *Epistles*, p. 461; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, I, p. 680.

29. For further reference outside the New Testament corpus, see Goldsmith, ' "Ask, and it will be Given..." ', p. 254 nn. 2-4; Brown, *Epistles*, p. 461; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, p. 680.

A glance here at its use in the New Testament as a whole quickly reveals that there are two features that are typical of its presentation. First, the giver in the saying is always assumed to be God[30] so that the logion is consistently placed in a prayer context. Indeed, explicit reference to prayer is included in two of the Synoptic examples (Mt. 21.22; Mk 11.24); compare also the reference to having παρρησίαν πρὸς τὸν θεόν in the 1 John passages (3.21; cf. 5.14).[31] Second, the logion usually appears hedged about with conditions and qualifiers.[32] This is hardly surprising: after all, it would not do for the faithful to think that it was suddenly open season on requests! Accordingly, the instructions in the Synoptics and James are that the request itself be a matter of Christian agreement and that the asking be done in faith (Mt. 18.19; 21.22; Mk 11.24; Jas 1.6). Similarly, the Johannine texts refer to keeping God's commandments, pleasing him, asking according to his will, and abiding in Jesus (1 Jn 3.22-23; 5.14; cf. Jn 14.15; 15.10, 12, 17; Jn 15.7; cf. 1 Jn 3.24).[33] There is no qualifier, however, in the case of Jn 11.22. Nor is the reason hard to find, for in this verse John has made the characteristically original move of applying the logion, not to

30. The similitude which accompanies the Q references (Mt. 7.9-11; Lk. 11.11-13) confirms that the giver is meant to be God, which means that the verb δοθήσεται in the logion is a 'divine' or 'theological' passive (see Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, I, p. 679; Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, III, p. 72; Loader, *Epistles*, p. 45; Grayston *Epistles*, p. 116). The reference to Jesus himself as the respondent in Jn 14.13-14 is not really an exception to this rule: as the context makes clear, prayer in this case is to the glorified Jesus in union with the Father (see, e.g., Lindars, *Gospel*, p. 476; Barrett, *Gospel*, p. 461; Sanders, *Gospel*, p. 325). This evidence in general lends support to the argument that the intended subject of δώσει in 1 Jn 5.16 is God (see above n. 22).

31. Note Dodd's point that the original meaning of the word παρρησία is 'freedom of speech' (*Epistles*, p. 93; see also Brooke, *Epistles*, p. 143; Alexander, *Epistles*, p. 98; Strecker, *Johannesbriefe*, p. 197). Despite the New Testament evidence, Goldsmith argues that the prayer context is not original to the logion but represents early church activity designed to restrain its radical social potential (' "Ask, and it will be Given..." ', esp. pp. 263-65).

32. This is recognized by most commentators but see esp. the discussion by Grayston (*Epistles*, p. 116).

33. *Pace* Brown, whose conclusion that the conditioned forms of the logion are not attributed to Jesus in the Johannine tradition is the unfortunate result of his failure to take the contexts of the Gospel references into account (*Gospel*, II, p. 635, cf. p. 634). His attitude is quite the reverse in his epistles commentary (*Epistles*, pp. 609, 635).

those who believe in Jesus, but to Jesus himself—who, of course, in all respects pleases God always (Jn 8.29; cf. 4.34; 15.10). Thus, in an interesting case of role reversal, what is proper to Christianity has, in the hands of the fourth evangelist, become Christology.[34]

On this showing, then, the basis for Martha's certainty in 11.22 consists in the fact that her words to Jesus are a version of the 'ask, and it will be given' logion from tradition, although this identification is almost never made in the commentaries and elsewhere.[35] In its immediate context, this application serves to focus attention on Jesus' God-given powers and so provides a point of entry into the teaching on Jesus as life-giver and agent of resurrection (vv. 25-26) which John has determined will be the main feature of the Jesus–Martha interview. However, as I hinted earlier, its effects on John's story are more far-reaching than this. The logion speaks of the certainty that requests made to God in prayer will be granted. I suggest that it is John's christological application of it in v. 22 that virtually dictates the terms in which he eventually describes Jesus at prayer before raising Lazarus. With that in mind, I will now return to the prayer and its context and attempt to follow John's tactics at that point.

Jesus' Prayer in Context

It is not until v. 38, following Jesus' emotional encounter with Mary, that John begins to set the scene for the miracle that will complete his narrative. He intends that Lazarus's return to life will become a σημεῖον of Jesus' teaching to Martha, a sample fulfilment of the promise that those who believe in him will be raised to life at the last day. To that end, he sees to it that reminders of the earlier pericope come thick and fast: here is the tomb (v. 38, cf. 17); here is Martha,

34. *Pace* Dodd (*Epistles*, p. 93), Brown (*Epistles*, p. 480) and Smalley (*1, 2, 3 John*, pp. 206, 296), the attribution was not to Jesus first in this case.

35. Among commentators, Lindars comes closest in remarking that Martha's words are 'reminiscent' of Mt. 7.7 and in also citing the later references to the logion in John (*Gospel*, p. 394). Although listed by Goldsmith (' "Ask, and it will be Given..." ', p. 254 n. 1), this reference is missing from the special studies of the logion by Dodd and Brown (see above, n. 28). It is also missing from J.D. Crossan's *Sayings Parallels: A Workbook for the Jesus Tradition* (Foundations and Facets; Philadelphia: Fortess Press, 1986), cf. p. 42, despite the author's claim to cite all instances involved in the corpus specified (p. xiii).

now admonished to remember what she was told (vv. 39-40, cf. 25-26); and here is the reference to Lazarus dead four days (v. 39, cf. v. 17). And here also, by the same token, is Jesus at prayer, predictably exhibiting the confidence that confirms the truth of Martha's certainty in v. 22 that whatever Jesus asks, God grants. Bearing this in mind, we need to take careful note of the words John has used. The expression εὐχαριστῶ σοι ὅτι ἤκουσάς μου in v. 41 is a quotation from Ps. 118.21 (LXX 117.21).[36] Placed on Jesus' lips, it conveniently introduces a perspective on him as one whom God hears. In the following words (v. 42a), this perspective is taken up and extended to affirm Jesus' own certainty (ᾔδειν) that this favourable reception from the Father is true of his prayer at all times.

So far, I have argued from evidence within the Lazarus story itself that the prayer in vv. 41-42 is the logical outcome of John's application to Jesus of the 'ask, and it will be given' logion in v. 22 and that the two are plainly linked. Nevertheless, a glance at the presentation of the logion in 1 John chapter 5 (see Fig. 2) leads one to suspect that the link between it and the prayer in the Gospel text may rest on rather more than logic. Note the ease with which the author of the epistle accommodates the assurances that God hears the faithful into his references to the logion in 5.14-15. In fact, 1 John's ἀκούει ἡμῶν actually penetrates the logion there to become the mid-point between the asking stage and the receiving/being given stage. It is worth reminding ourselves at this point that the epistle writer is not in the business of forging radical new policies; on the contrary, he is bent on assuring his readers of their loyalty to tried and tested teaching. This attitude, together with the comfortable manner in which the hearing references are introduced into the logion, suggest that the association of the two is a familiar and longstanding one in Johannine circles. The likelihood of this is increased when we consider that the description of God as a 'hearer' of prayer, which is a distinctive feature of the Johannine

36. As identified by A.T. Hanson and M. Wilcox, working independently of one another. Hanson was the first to get into print, see 'The Old Testament Background to the Raising of Lazarus', in E.A. Livingstone (ed.), *Studia Evangelica*, VI (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, 112; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1973), pp. 252-55 (254). Wilcox published four years later, by which time the coincidence had been discovered, see 'The "Prayer" of Jesus in John XI.41b-42', *NTS* 24 (1977), pp. 128-32 (130 n. 5); see further, A.T. Hanson, *The New Testament Interpretation of Scripture* (London: SPCK, 1980), p. 210 n. 21.

writings,[37] is also a significant element in the Old Testament presentation of God and in Judaism generally.[38] Thus, the link that we find in the epistle writer's text probably goes back to the community's Jewish roots. In other words, it is not impossible that what comes to light in 1 Jn 5.14-15 reflects something of the network of unspoken communication between the evangelist and his own readers in John chapter 11. If this is so, then we may safely assume, for reasons behind the text as well as in it, that those who first heard the Lazarus story will have had no difficulty in connecting the reference to God hearing Jesus in the prayer with the statement of the logion earlier placed on the lips of Martha.

In that moment of recognition, the evangelist's community, perhaps already in danger on account of their faith, will surely have been comforted. Here John has shown them Jesus himself at prayer, supremely fulfilling all the promise of the 'ask, and it will be given' logion. He is not only aware of having been heard specifically in relation to raising Lazarus from the dead (11.41) but also, with the words ἐγὼ δὲ ᾔδειν ὅτι πάντοτέ μου ἀκούεις ('I knew that thou hearest me always') (v. 42) he is secure in the knowledge of the Father's immediate affirming response to any petition he might make.[39] In that security lies the evangelist's message to his beleaguered flock, for it confirms them in their faith as Christians. On this basis, they can be certain that prayers offered by those who believe in Jesus will always be heard by God. Indeed, as the Johannine Jesus himself repeatedly insists in references to the logion elsewhere in the Gospel, those who continue his work in the world should ask the Father ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου ('in my name') and their requests will be granted (14.13-14; 15.16; 16.23-26).[40]

37. Apart from the Johannine references, the New Testament as a whole has only six instances where God is associated with verbs of hearing. Two of these are in quotations from the Old Testament (Acts 7.34; 2 Cor. 6.2) and the remaining four all use the 'divine' passive (Mt. 6.7; Lk. 1.13; Acts 10.31; Heb. 5.7). Kittel attributes this restraint to the desire to differentiate Christianity from the popular pagan image of the 'hearing' deity ('ἀκούω', *TDNT*, I, pp. 216-25 [221, 222]).

38. See esp. G.F. Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim* (3 vols.; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1927–30), II, pp. 215, 231.

39. *Pace* Bultmann *et al.*, the ideal of a constant prayerful attitude is not implied by this text.

40. Schnackenburg is surely correct in insisting that the phrase 'in my name' is not a condition but represents a Johannine development of the logion which belongs

Thus, it seems that Hoskyns's 'democratic' instincts were to be trusted.[41] On this showing, John's purpose in 11.41-42 was neither to promote debate on whether or not Jesus really prays nor to invite his readers to glimpse the Son's unique communion with the Father. On the contrary, when Jesus' words are interpreted within the context of the story they were designed to fit, it emerges that what John has provided in this instance is a demonstration, in the person of Jesus himself, of the power of Christian prayer.

to a context of mission (*Gospel*, III, pp. 72-73; see further Dodd, *Historical Tradition*, p. 351 and Brown, *Gospel*, II, p. 635, both of whom compare the partial parallel in Mt. 18.20). Thus, those who pray in Jesus' name are those whom Jesus has sent, who represent him on earth and who ask in his place (see Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, III, pp. 73, 160; Lindars, *Gospel*, pp. 476, 492, 511; Sanders, *Gospel*, pp. 324, 342).

41. Hoskyns unhesitatingly compares Jesus' prayer here with the promise enshrined in Johannine and Synoptic references to the logion (*Gospel*, p. 406).

Chapter 5

THE MAKING OF THE LAZARUS STORY

In three detailed studies so far, I have used 1 John as a control to identify traditional material in the Gospel text which the evangelist has expounded in his account of the raising of Lazarus. To judge from the results in each case, we must surely allow that the influence of that material has been considerable, enabling us to account for a high proportion of John's narrative in chapter 11 as well as aspects of its immediate setting. However, as I indicated in chapter 1, the epistle is not a guide to everything the evangelist knew. My aim in this chapter is to attempt a description of the making of the Lazarus story in its entirety, and for that I need to use 1 John in conjunction with other resources which are narrative in style. There is no parallel, of course, to the actual miracle John records. Even so, however, his extended account has important links not only with the Synoptic tradition but also with other narratives within his own Gospel which are tradition-based. These narrative contacts are as follows.

Martha and Mary

The sisters are already known to us from the delightful vignette in Lk. 10.38-42. There we learn that Martha received Jesus into her house (εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, v. 38),[1] that her sister Mary sat at Jesus' feet and heard his word (παρακαθεσθεῖσα πρὸς τοὺς πόδας τοῦ κυρίου ἤκουεν τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ, v. 39),[2] and that Martha herself was distracted with much serving (πολλὴν διακονίαν) and complained about being left without help (v. 40). Snippets of Luke's presentation of the women are

1. N-A[27], however, omits this phrase. See also Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, p. 129.

2. Luke has Mary strike the pose proper to a disciple; cf. 8.35 (Legion) but esp. Acts 22.3 (Paul at the feet of Gamaliel).

also present in John's text. At 12.2, John tells us that it was Martha who served (διηκόνει) at the family supper in Jesus' honour. Perhaps also we detect an appropriately practical touch in 11.39 as she warns Jesus of the stench of Lazarus's corpse after four days. In Mary's case, we learn from John in 11.20 that she sat in the house (ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ ἐκαθέζετο), which is where she heard (ἤκουσεν) and responded to Jesus' message (11.28-29). Thereafter, John consistently places Mary, by contrast with Martha, at Jesus' feet (11.32, cf. v. 21; 12.3). In three respects, however, John's report of the sisters either differs from Luke's or appears to represent a development of the tradition Luke knew. First, John identifies their village as Bethany near Jerusalem (11.1, cf. 12.1). This owes nothing to Luke, who does not name the village (Lk. 10.38) and appears to locate it in Galilee.[3] Second, John claims that there was a third member of the family, a brother named Lazarus (Jn 11.2). Luke shows no knowledge of this. His own presentation of the sisters, tellingly in a scene where Jesus is *chez elles* (cf. 10.38), contains no hint of a third sibling.[4] As far as Luke is concerned, Lazarus is a poor man in a parable (Lk. 16. 19-31). Third, John identifies Mary as the woman who anointed Jesus' feet (Jn 12.3). In detail, Mary's action strikingly resembles that of the penitent sinner in another of Luke's Galilean stories (Lk. 7.36-50, cf. v. 38). In Luke, however, the anointer remains anonymous and no link is intended between her and Martha's sister in chapter 10. Evidently these two unrelated figures in Luke had fused into one by the time John wrote his own account. Perhaps it was reasoned in Johannine circles that the woman who anointed Jesus' feet must also have been the woman who faithfully sat at them.

Lazarus

Quite how a poor beggar in a parable in Luke and a dead man raised in a miracle in John came to have the same name is something of a puzzle.

3. *Pace* Brown, who notes that the previous story in Luke (10.30-37) features a journey from Jerusalem to Jericho which would pass through Bethany and suggests that Luke could have known but obscured the fact that the sisters lived there (*Gospel*, I, p. 422). This is to complicate matters unnecessarily. For reference to and rejection of Brown's proposal, see Lindars, *Gospel*, p. 385.

4. See M. Scott, *Sophia and the Johannine Jesus* (JSNTSup, 71; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992), p. 198, who sees this lack of knowledge on Luke's part as a stumbling block to any theory of direct dependence of John on Luke.

It is possible that the parable, in which Lazarus's resurrection is contemplated (Lk. 16.30-31), has been turned into an event in the process of transmission.[5] Equally, however, one could argue that the direction of influence has gone the other way and that the name came to be inserted into the parable from an early version of the miracle story. Dodd, among others, prefers this second option.[6] He points out that Luke's parable is the only one in the Gospels in which a character is given a name. Thus, he reasons, the name must be secondary and have come from the miracle. However, Dodd's argument can cut both ways. What he fails to observe is the parallel point that John's story is the only one in his Gospel in which a character restored by Jesus' miraculous powers is given a name. Up to this stage, in fact, John has shown no inclination to supply names for characters in miracles: the Capernaum official, the paralysed man and the man born blind all remain as anonymous in his stories as are their counterparts in the Synoptic tradition.[7] Thus, on Dodd's logic, there is really nothing to choose between the two options and the name could be secondary in both John and Luke. However, it may be possible to arrive at some tentative conclusions in John's case from the way he actually deals with the name in his text. There are two relevant points here. First, it is noticeable that John makes nothing of the name itself: it drops into his text without ceremony and he makes no mileage out of its meaning,

5. See, e.g., Barrett, *Gospel*, p. 389; Bultmann, *Gospel*, p. 396 n. 3; Lindars, *Gospel*, p. 384. Fortna suggests that the pre-Johannine tale was a 'highly derived form' of the Lukan parable (*Predecessor*, p. 96).

6. See Dodd, *Historical Tradition*, p. 229; also Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, II, p. 342; Brown, *Gospel*, I, p. 429.

7. For the Capernaum official (Jn 4.46-54), cf. Mt. 8.5-13; Lk. 7.1-10; for the paralysed man (Jn 5.1-18), cf. Mt. 9.1-8; Mk 2.1-12; Lk. 5.17-26; for the man born blind (Jn 9.1-41), cf. Mk 8.22-26. There are, of course, some names in the miracles tradition, but this is not customary and none of them occurs in John. See the list in J. Kremer, *Lazarus: Die Geschichte einer Auferstehung: Text, Wirkungsgeschichte und Botschaft von Joh 11, 1-46* (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1985), p. 52. Dodd is certainly not justified in remarking that 'there is nothing exceptional in the occurrence of the name Lazarus here' (*Historical Tradition*, p. 229). On the tendency in Christian tradition to supply names for anonymous figures, see B.M. Metzger, 'Names for the Nameless in the New Testament: A Study in the Growth of Christian Tradition', in *idem*, *New Testament Studies: Philological, Versional, and Patristic* (NTTS, 10; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1980), pp. 23-43. Metzger cites John's naming of Mary as the anointer as a case in point (p. 42).

even though, as it happens, that is by no means irrelevant to the tone of assurance he intends to convey with this sign.[8] In other words, he simply takes the name for granted, a factor which suggests that he has already known it from some other context. Second, to judge from the way John introduces the name in 11.1 (see below), it appears that it is not known to his readers. If this is correct, then it is extremely unlikely that name and miracle belonged together in the community tradition on which John drew. Thus, it is possible that in this case, and for his own reasons, John has deliberately added in the name to his miracle story. Perhaps he needed a third name to complete the family circle given that the sisters were already named. Perhaps also, he chose the name Lazarus because he already knew from another context, such as the parable Luke records, that the name was associated with the theme of resurrection.[9]

Bethany

In 11.1 and 12.1, John specifies that Martha, Mary and Lazarus live at Bethany near Jerusalem (cf. 11.18). This location derives from the anointing tradition as represented in Matthew (26.6-13) and Mark (14.3-9) where, in both cases, the incident is situated at Bethany (Mt. 26.6; Mk 14.3). In fact, apart from the detail of the anointing itself—which comes closest to Luke (cf. Lk. 7.38)—the overwhelming influence on John's own account in 12.1-8 is undoubtedly the version found in the other two Gospels. This is especially true with reference to Mark's text, where the extent of exact verbal agreement with John is particularly striking.[10] Thus, in common with Matthew and Mark, but

8. The Greek presupposes an abbreviated form of the Hebrew and means 'God helps'. See, e.g., Barrett, *Gospel*, p. 389.

9. Brown (*Gospel*, I, p. 429) suggests that Lk. 16.27-31 was possibly an 'afterthought' which was added under the influence of a primitive version of the Johannine tradition. However, as I have pointed out, it is not clear on other grounds that the name was original to John's miracle. Perhaps what John actually knew was something closer to Luke's afterthought. Certainly he shows no knowledge of the main section of the parable (see Lindars, *Gospel*, p. 385).

10. See further Sproston, ' "The Scripture" in John 17.12', pp. 28-29. For the argument that John's account of the anointing was directly dependent on the Markan and Lukan versions, see M. Sabbe, 'The Anointing of Jesus in John 12.1-8 and its Synoptic Parallels', in F. van Segbroeck *et al.* (eds.), *The Four Gospels 1992*

not Luke, John locates the anointing at Bethany. Unlike all three of them, however, he also identifies the woman who anointed Jesus as Mary, sister to Martha. As far as John is concerned, this establishes that the sisters' house was at Bethany (12.1). By the same token, it also ensures that the setting for the Lazarus story, in which the sisters and their home circumstances feature prominently, would be Bethany also.[11]

Links with Synoptic Raising Accounts

The Synoptic evangelists were well aware that Jesus was known to have raised the dead. All three report the raising of Jairus's daughter (Mt. 9.18-26; Mk 5.21-43; Lk. 8.40-56) and, according to Luke, Jesus also raised a widow's son at Nain (Lk. 7.11-17).[12] Thus, John's story of the raising of Lazarus, even though unparalleled, is not without precedent in the Synoptic tradition. In fact, seen from this perspective, it becomes part of the New Testament witness as a whole to Jesus' miraculous powers and, as such, can be expected to compare favourably with other stories of the type. Dodd takes a particular interest in demonstrating the formal similarity between John's raising narrative and lengthier Synoptic accounts such as the cure of the epileptic boy and Jairus's daughter in its Markan version. In fact, he finds many more parallels with the latter. Despite this, his conclusion is that these 'coincidences' establish only that John's narrative is of the same genre as the Markan examples, on which basis he can claim that it is rooted in tradition.[13] Schnackenburg also recognizes that there are points of contact between John's narrative and Mark's raising story but insists that these 'do not go beyond form-critical elements'.[14] Perhaps, however, this is to protest too much. As we shall see, the list of similarities is easily extended to include details of content as well as form. Indeed, in one particular instance, the parallel appears to consist of an entire Jesus saying. This does not mean, of course, that we should rush to

(Festschrift Frans Neirynck; 3 vols.; BETL, 100; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), III, pp. 2051-82.

11. See Lindars, *Gospel*, p. 385.

12. Luke also records the raising of a female disciple by Peter and of a young man by Paul (Acts 9.36-43; 20.9-12).

13. Dodd, *Historical Tradition*, pp. 229-32.

14. Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, II, p. 341.

conclude that Mark's text was John's source for the Lazarus miracle. It does raise the possibility, however, that John knew Mark and was capable of drawing on that knowledge in the process of formulating his own composition.[15]

Links with Other Johannine Narratives

As the Gospel now stands, the Lazarus story occupies a key position in its structure. It is the central scene where, in a magnificent irony, Jesus' act of giving life becomes the first link in the chain of events leading to his death. As Frank Kermode puts it, John's raising story is 'a great hinge of his plot'.[16] Nevertheless, it seems that this was not always the case. It is generally held that the Lazarus story was added into the Gospel at a later stage, probably as part of a second edition.[17] Assuming this is correct, it has important consequences for our understanding of how John has worked. This means that the story was interpolated into already existing material. No doubt, in the process, some of that material underwent adjustment and some may even have been displaced.[18] The crucial point for our purposes, however, is that, in composing the story itself, John also designed it to fit into its new surroundings. He has achieved this in a number of ways. His most obvious ploy is the explicit cross-reference. Note, for example, how the disciples' fear for Jesus' life in 11.8 preserves continuity with the previous chapter (cf. 10.31-33) and how, in 11.37, reference by 'the Jews' to the cure of the blind man maintains a link with the previous sign.[19] In fact, by this and subtler means, John has contrived to relate

15. We saw reason in Chapter 3 to suspect that John was acquainted with Mark's text. See above, pp. 78-79.

16. Kermode, 'John', p. 456.

17. Grayston (*Gospel*, p. xix) suggests that both chapters 11 and 12 were an editorial addition, as does Brown (*Gospel*, I, pp. 427-28). However, this does not necessarily follow; see Ashton, *Understanding*, p. 201 n. 5. It is possible that the second edition included at least chapters 6, 15–17 and 21, all of which seem to offer assurance in the face of martyrdom. See above, in Chapters 2 and 3.

18. On this, see esp. Lindars, *Gospel*, pp. 380-81.

19. Dodd makes the point that the narratives in chapters 9 and 11 contain the twin themes of light and life, which are first linked in the Gospel prologue (cf. 1.4) (*Interpretation*, p. 364). This point is taken up by Schnackenburg (*Gospel*, II, p. 316), Brown (*Gospel*, I, p. 430) and in D.A. Lee, *The Symbolic Narratives of the*

the Lazarus story to narratives elsewhere in his Gospel ranging from chapters 2 to 20.[20] Perhaps, however, it is with the material in chapter 12 that this linking technique is most in evidence. Quite clearly, John has intended the two chapters to be taken as a unit. This is already obvious from the 'flashforward'[21] in 11.2 to Jesus' anointing by Mary (12.3). Nevertheless, this is only one of numerous points of continuity, all designed to create the impression of what Pierre Mourlon Beernaert calls 'un grand *diptyque*'.[22] For this reason, we must be alert to the possibility that the narratives in chapter 12 and the traditions behind them will have contributed considerably to the formation of the Lazarus story.

'The Jews'

One of the most distinctive characteristics of John's narrative is his constant reference to a group he calls 'the Jews'. For the most part, he presents this group as a hostile and menacing force. He identifies them as authorities who use their power to evict the faithful from the synagogue (9.22, 34; cf. 12.42), as people of whom others go in fear (7.13; 9.22; 19.38; 20.19) and as Jesus' implacable opponents who seek to kill him and to kill those who believe in him (5.18; 7.19; 8.59; 10.31-33; 11.8, 53; 19.15; cf. 16.2). As far as John is concerned, such people are the devil's progeny, who love darkness and inhabit a world under judgment to which Jesus and the believers do not belong (3.19-20; 8.23, 37-47; 12.31). On this evidence, there can be no doubt that John's 'Jews' are intended as a grotesque caricature of Judaism and its threat to his community at the time of writing.[23] Nevertheless, and

Fourth Gospel: The Interplay of Form and Meaning (JSNTSup, 95; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994), p. 190.

20. On these links, see Dodd, *Interpretation*, p. 367; Lindars, *Gospel*, pp. 379, 382-83; Lee, *Symbolic Narratives*, p. 190; and M.W.G. Stibbe, 'A Tomb with a View: John 11.1-44 in Narrative-Critical Perspective', *NTS* 40 (1994), pp. 38-54 (39).

21. The term is Stibbe's; see 'Tomb', p. 39.

22. See P. Mourlon Beernaert, 'Parallelisme entre Jean 11 et 12: Etude de structure littéraire et théologique', in A.-L. Descamps *et al.*, *Genèse et structure d'un texte du Nouveau Testament: Etude interdisciplinaire du chapître 11 de l'évangile de Jean* (LD, 104; Paris: Cerf; Louvain-La-Neuve: Cabay, 1981), pp. 123-49 (135; emphasis his).

23. See S. Freyne, 'Vilifying the Other and Defining the Self: Matthew's and

interestingly, not all of John's 'Jews' conform to the minatory type. In fact, although in general his scheme of things operates in terms of absolutes and polarities—good versus evil or, as John puts it, light versus darkness—there are points where John's distinctions are rather more subtle. Between these two extremes, there exist what we might call 'the twilight people', occupying a position somewhere between the totally enlightened and the utterly benighted. These are not overtly opposed to Jesus. On the contrary, they can be sympathetic and well intentioned, and are often confused and mystified in response to Jesus rather than classically hostile.[24] They can also believe in Jesus although, in John's opinion, their faith is of a rather inferior, miracle-centred variety.[25] This type is summed up in the figure of Nicodemus,[26] who is 'a ruler of the Jews' (3.1). Impressed by the signs and, on that account, untrustworthy (2.23-24; 3.2), Nicodemus comes to Jesus 'by night' and never quite manages to shake free of the shadows (3.2; 19.39). He fails to grasp the essentials of Johannine truth, he retains a perspective focused on law, and he continues to the last to act secretly and to follow the customs of 'the Jews' (3.10; 7.51; 19.38-40).[27] In

John's Anti-Jewish Polemic in Focus', in J. Neusner and E.S. Frerichs (eds.), *'To See Ourselves as Others See Us': Christians, Jews, 'Others' in Late Antiquity* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985), pp. 117-43 (125). See also Culpepper, *Anatomy*, p. 130.

24. See 7.12, 20, 40-44 (the crowd): 7.25-27 (the Jerusalemites); 6.41-42, 52; 7.35-36; 10.19-21 ('the Jews'). Freyne calls such groups 'borderline cases' ('Vilifying', p. 140).

25. For this interest, see 2.23; 6.2, 14, 30; 7.31; 10.41. Note the scornful comment in 2.24; 4.48; 6.26. Further on miracles-faith in John. see W. Nicol, *The Sēmeia in the Fourth Gospel: Tradition and Redaction* (NovTSup, 32; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1972), pp. 99-102. In John's opinion, true faith is based on Jesus' word, see 4.39, 41-42; 50 cf. v. 53; 5.24; 6.63; 8.30-31. Scott argues this point well (*Sophia*, pp. 204-205).

26. Nicodemus's 'we' in 3.2 is indicative that he speaks for a group. Note also the 'you' plural in Jesus' address to him in vv. 11-12. On Nicodemus's representative role, see esp. Freyne, 'Vilifying', pp. 126-27, 140.

27. Note esp. Nicodemus's expression 'our law' in 7.51 and contrast Jesus' references to 'your/their law' in 8.17; 10.34; 15.25; cf. 7.19. On Nicodemus's law-focused perspective, see Freyne, 'Vilifying', p. 127. There can be no doubt of John's disapproval of the Nicodemus type. See further M. de Jonge, *Jesus: Stranger from Heaven and Son of God: Jesus Christ and the Christians in Johannine Perspective* (SBLSBS, 11; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977), pp. 29-47; J.M. Bassler, 'Mixed Signals: Nicodemus in the Fourth Gospel', *JBL* 108 (1989), pp. 635-46; and

John's book, Nicodemus and his kind belong to 'the Jews', not because of any hostility on their part, but because they are part and parcel of the opposite camp. Almost certainly, this lukewarm type is also drawn from circumstances in the Gospel's immediate background. In this case, it is likely that John is targeting certain 'closet' Christians who have remained within the synagogue which has so bitterly excluded his own group. John sees this as a lily-livered compromise which lacks the calibre of true faith (12.42-43).[28]

The 'Jews' we encounter in the Lazarus story belong to this second category.[29] They sympathize with the sisters and weep with Mary at the tomb (11.19, 33). Never quite grasping the deeper issues and always on the alert for a miracle (vv. 36-37), they believe because of the sign, although some prove less than trustworthy (vv. 45-46). We meet them again in the following chapter. This time a great crowd of these 'Jews' flocks to Bethany, not only because of Jesus, we hear, but to see the spectacle of Lazarus raised from the dead (12.9). Indeed, according to John, it is this crowd's witness to the Lazarus sign which accounts for the enthusiastic reception given to Jesus on his entry into Jerusalem (vv. 17-18). Strictly speaking, the presence of these 'Jews' is not

M.D. Goulder, 'Nicodemus', *SJT* 44 (1991), pp. 153-68.

28. Note esp. the scathing comment in 12.43 reserved for those 'rulers' (v. 42; cf. Nicodemus, 3.1) who believe but remain low-profile. John accuses them of seeking men's honour rather than God's or, perhaps better to capture the flavour of the remark, of being a set of snivelling little toads. Despite this, it is not impossible that the goal of John's polemic was to win over these synagogue fence-sitters to full Johannine membership; see esp. S.J. Tanzer, 'Salvation is *for* the Jews: Secret Christian Jews in the Gospel of John', in B.A. Pearson (ed.), *The Future of Early Christianity: Essays in Honor of Helmut Koester* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), pp. 285-300; also Longenecker, 'Unbroken Messiah'.

29. *Pace* Brown (*Gospel*, I, pp. 427-28), the treatment of 'the Jews' here is not inconsistent with references elsewhere in the Gospel and thus does not constitute evidence of the work of a redactor. Lee also prefers to differentiate between οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι here and at other points in the Gospel. She is surely correct, however, in resisting the view that the term simply denotes 'Judaeans' (*Symbolic Narratives*, p. 189 n. 4). See further the careful discussion on this issue in J. Ashton's article, 'The Identity and Function of the Ἰουδαῖοι in the Fourth Gospel', *NovT* 27 (1985), pp. 40-75, esp. pp. 57-58 on the distinction between sense and reference. This is now reprinted as 'The Jews in John', in Ashton, *Studying John*, pp. 36-70. Since completing this book, I have been informed that in the new (third English) edition of BAGD (2000), F.W. Danke prefers 'Judean' as the primary translation of Ἰουδαῖος. I take this to be a sign of the times.

essential to the fabric of John's Lazarus story. Once on the scene, they contribute nothing to the action but merely respond to the various moves of the principal characters. Nevertheless, from an editorial point of view, they are indispensable as a means of furthering John's plot at this stage in the Gospel. If, as we suppose here, the interpolation of the Lazarus story has necessitated the rearrangement of existing material, then John will have sought for ways of linking the episodes in his newly ordered narrative. The presence of 'the Jews' in chapters 11 and 12 fulfils this function nicely. Note how their signs-faith becomes the occasion for the authorities to act decisively against Jesus at the council meeting, which is now a pendant to the Lazarus story (11.45-48; cf. also 12.10-11, with reference to Lazarus).[30] Similarly, their reappearance in 12.9 successfully ensures continuity between the anointing story, where Lazarus is at table (vv. 1-8, cf. v. 2), and the triumphal entry with its adulatory crowd (vv. 12-19, cf. v. 17).[31]

Armed with the results of the work with 1 John and with what can be gleaned from comparisons with other narratives, I am now in a position to attempt a description of how the Lazarus story was created. Before I embark on that, however, there is one further aspect of John's composition which needs to be considered. This is the elusive element to which we have no guide, namely, his source for the miracle itself.

30. Note also how, according to John, signs-faith has prompted the authorities to act against Jesus on a previous occasion (7.31-32). If, as Lindars proposes, the Lazarus story has replaced the cleansing of the Temple in the original edition of the Gospel, then John will have needed to supply a reason for the authorities to act in response to this miracle (see Lindars, *Gospel*, pp. 380-81). The implication is that Jesus is poaching their own (12.11, cf. v. 19).

31. *Pace* Lee (*Symbolic Narratives*, pp. 191-97), who regards John's extended narrative as complete at 12.11 despite his further reference to the Lazarus miracle in v. 17 (see her comment, p. 191 n. 4). She claims that the structure of 11.1–12.11 is chiastic with the miracle scene itself (11.38-44) as central. Generally speaking, John's text has a disconcerting habit of resisting neat schematizing and, unfortunately, this is another case in point. Lee's proposal depends on the equivalence of 11.1-16 and 12.9-11 where the issue in both passages is the threat to Lazarus's life. Since the nature of the threat is different in each case, Lee's structure already looks a little strained and, in fact, is easily collapsed by the observation that the notification of the authorities' intention to kill Lazarus in 12.10 is nothing more than a copy-cat version of the decision against Jesus described in 11.53.

John's Source for the Miracle

Almost certainly such a source will have existed. For all his creativity, John is no dealer in fiction. On the contrary, he looks for revelation in actual historical event and seeks to expound it. As he himself might have put it, it is a matter of seeing the δόξα in the reality of the σάρξ.[32] Thus, it is entirely likely that the σάρξ in this case, in which Martha is invited to see the δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ (11.40), was a genuine story from tradition in which Jesus brought a dead man to life. Beyond this bare outline, however, it is impossible to tell anything about the source-material itself. With no parallel to help us, we are deprived of the only secure means of judging the whereabouts and the extent of the tradition used. This difficulty, however, has not prevented an army of source-critics from attempting to recover John's source by detailed analysis of the narrative itself.[33] There are no reliable criteria for this procedure and all too often the results are based on conjecture and assumption without proof. For example, there is no guarantee that John has reproduced his source-material intact and entire. For that, we must rely on Fortna's conviction that it was so.[34] Also, it is highly unlikely that

32. On this point, see the remarks by Nicol (*Sēmeia*, p. 6) and Lee (*Symbolic Narratives*, p. 223). *Pace* H. Thyen, who claims that the Lazarus story is a free composition based only on elements taken directly from the Synoptic Gospels ('Die Erzählung von den Bethanischen Geschwistern [Joh 11, 1-12, 19] als "Palimpsest" über Synoptischen Texten', in F. van Segbroeck *et al.* [eds.], *The Four Gospels 1992* (Festschrift Frans Neirynck; 3 vols.; BETL, 100; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), III, pp. 2021-2050, esp. pp. 2034-2040).

33. The history of the identification of the signs-source is reviewed in Nicol, *Sēmeia*, pp. 9-14. For the most comprehensive survey, see more recently G. van Belle, *The Signs Source in the Fourth Gospel: Historical Survey and Critical Evaluation of the Semeia Hypothesis* (BETL, 116; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1994). Van Belle eventually rejects the hypothesis, see esp. pp. 370-77. See also E. Ruckstuhl and P. Dschulnigg, *Stilkritik*, p. 241. For a detailed discussion of the various source-critical proposals for the Lazarus story, see esp. Beasley-Murray, *John*, pp. 184-86.

34. See Fortna, *Gospel of Signs*, p. 75 and esp. pp. 85-86 for the beefy narrative Fortna claims to have recovered. It is interesting to note that with the passage of time and further thought Fortna's 'source' is somewhat reduced (see *Predecessor*, pp. 94-95). Perhaps we may expect this trend to continue. See further Ashton's remarks, with reference to Fortna, on the irrecoverability of John's source material ('The Signs Source', in *idem*, *Studying John*, pp. 90-113, esp. pp. 103-106).

the source can be laid bare by paring the narrative down to the story-line, as Wilkens does. As if John could not have composed a story-line![35] Yet again, it does not automatically follow, as Lindars assumes, that to trace the origin of a single rare expression in the narrative is to discover the key to the source.[36] As it now stands, John's account is clearly a cocktail of different materials, and there is no certainty that any one of these, however intriguing, has derived from the miracle source.

My own approach differs from these studies in that it does not seek to discover the source but focuses instead on the final text and how John worked to produce it. Inevitably, however, my conclusions will have a bearing on the various source-critical proposals. What I have analysed of the story so far strongly suggests that it is a superb piece of redaction based on detectable source-material which is largely outside the chapter. If this is indeed the case, then it puts a serious question mark against claims to have recovered John's miracle source. This is not to say, of course, that what can be accounted for as the fruits of redaction cannot also in some manner represent the miracle story he knew. This is always a possibility because we cannot know the extent to which John has over-written the tradition to suit his own purposes. What it does mean, however, is that if material can be successfully identified as redactional, it cannot also be claimed as John's source in its original, unpolished form.

35. See W. Wilkens, 'Die Erweckung des Lazarus', *TZ* 15 (1959), pp. 22-39, esp. pp. 26-27. For comment on and criticism of Wilkens's approach, see Dodd, *Historical Tradition*, pp. 230-32; Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, II, p. 318; Brown, *Gospel*, I, pp. 429-30; Lindars, *Behind the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 41, 58; *idem*, *Gospel*, p. 383. For another skeletal reconstruction, see Kremer, *Lazarus*, pp. 89-90, with reference to the work of Boismard and Lamouille. An even slimmer version is suggested by J. Wagner in *idem*, *Auferstehung und Leben: Joh 11, 1-12, 19 als Spiegel johanneischer Redactions- und Theologiegeschichte* (Biblische Untersuchungen, 19; Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1988), pp. 341-42. For the reverse, see the study by Delbert Burkett, who conjectures that the whole of the Lazarus story consists of two originally separate narratives in combination ('Two Accounts of Lazarus' Ressurection in John 11', *NovT* 36 [1994], pp. 209-232).

36. See B. Lindars, 'Rebuking the Spirit: A New Analysis of the Lazarus Story of John 11', in Tuckett (ed.), *Essays*, pp. 183-98.

Preparation and Planning

Having discovered what we can of the different strands that go to make up the Lazarus story, it is now time to watch John at work, weaving them into a rich fabric of his own design. Not that artifice will have been uppermost in his mind at the time. By this stage, he had evidently come to fear that Judaism's hostility towards his community was about to erupt into violence.[37] No doubt his thoughts were filled with this crisis and the urgent need to address it. It is just possible, in fact, that the situation was already taking its toll and John's community was beginning to fragment (cf. 6.66[38] and the constant call to remain 'one' in chapter 17). His overriding concern at this point is to confirm his flock in their faith as Christians so that they will stand firm and, if need be, find the resolve to tread the martyr's path. The main thrust of his message to them will be that to believe in Jesus is to possess eternal life that death cannot vanquish. It is not that his community are unfamiliar with this teaching. They already know the tradition that to hear Jesus' word is to have passed from death to life, which is also enshrined and expounded in John's own text (5.24-29).[39] Moreover, he has already presented Jesus as the giver of life in an earlier sign (4.46-54).[40] Rather, what John is seeking to do here is to present this truth afresh in as spectacular a form as possible so that it creates maximum impact. From his knowledge of Jesus' words and deeds he selects a story which suits this purpose. It tells of a miracle in which Jesus raised a man from the dead. As he proceeds, John will remould this tale to convey his own special interests. The act itself will become a σημεῖον of Jesus' God-given powers to raise the faithful dead to life at the end of the age. This is because in the telling it will take on the character of the tradition in 5.24 and the exposition which follows it. John will also ensure that Jesus himself pursues his mission in a situation of grave personal danger. For that he turns to another saying from the tradition which is Jesus' own definition of love and also a self-portrait

37. As argued above in Chapter 2.

38. On the *Sitz im Leben* of Jn 6, see above, Chapter 3 n. 102.

39. As argued above in Chapter 3.

40. See Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, II, p. 330; Lindars, *Gospel*, p. 222; *idem*, 'Capernaum Revisited: John 4, 46-53 and the Synoptics', in Tuckett (ed.), *Essays*, pp. 199-214 (206-207).

(cf. 15.13). Thus, the dead man will become the φίλος for whom Jesus lays down his life and this scenario will be an occasion for a call to martyrdom. John's general intention, however, is to convey assurance and hope. Yet another tradition will turn into a demonstration that God always hears those who pray in Jesus' name (cf. 16.23-24)[41] and, in the end, he will show Jesus victorious over death.

It is probably at this point that John decides that the Lazarus story will take up the pivotal position in the Gospel structure it now occupies. Note that in chapter 10 the positive and negative aspects of Jesus' career are already present in combination. As the Good Shepherd, Jesus not only gives life (10.10, 28) but also, in a pastoral adaptation of the tradition in 15.13, he surrenders his own life for their sakes (10.11, 15, 17-18). Thus, the tone is conveniently set in this chapter.[42] With 'the Jews' breathing death-threats (10.31-33, cf. v. 39), the dramatic expectation is that a point must come when Jesus will confront his enemies.[43] John can now continue the irony and play it to the full by ensuring that Jesus' decision to give life is the means by which his death is formally determined (11.47-53).[44] And so, settled in his intentions, with tradition at his fingertips, and with more than an eye on the surrounding context, John takes up his pen and begins to write.

Preface (10.40-42)

His first task is to modify the original ending to the public ministry. Almost certainly this contained some mention of John the Baptist, which served to round off this whole section of the Gospel by referring to its beginning (cf. 1.19).[45] Now, however, John needs to reintroduce the theme of Jesus' signs and to set the stage for the action to follow.

41. Note that John also associates the 'ask, and it will be given' logion with the tradition on love in 15.12-17 (cf. v. 16).

42. As argued above in chapter 2. See further, Dodd, *Interpretation*, p. 367; Lindars, *Gospel*, p. 383; Sloyan, *John*, p. 140.

43. For this point, see Lee, *Symbolic Narratives*, I, pp. 190-91.

44. On the present position of the Lazarus account as an instance of Johannine pedagogical and theological genius, see Brown, *Gospel*, I, pp. 429-30.

45. On the Baptist reference here as a case of *inclusio*, see Lindars, *Behind the Fourth Gospel*, p. 63. This surely points to modification of existing material rather than to a completely fresh start, *pace* Ashton, *Understanding*, p. 202.

Placing Jesus at a distance from the scene where the miracle eventually happens (v. 40) serves his purpose in two ways. First, it ensures that when Jesus hears about Lazarus, he is not on the spot to cure the illness. John is alert to this possibility (cf. 11.21, 32) and has not the slightest intention of allowing it to cast doubt on the genuineness of the miracle. In the event, he will not only stress Jesus' absence as grounds for faith (11.15) but will also keep Jesus away from Bethany until Lazarus is well beyond his healing powers and dead past any shadow of doubt (11.17). Second, the specific location beyond the Jordan[46] ensures that Jesus must re-enter Judaea, and so endanger his own life, in order to bestow life on Lazarus. Thus, the journey to Lazarus will be for Jesus a journey towards death and John will be quick to bring this circumstance to his readers' attention (11.7-8, cf. v. 16).[47]

The statement 'John did no sign' (v. 41) comes as a surprise since there has been no discussion in the Gospel so far on whether or not the Baptist performed miracles. Nevertheless, its appearance here is probably due to the evangelist's editorial concerns at this point rather than to the presence of some unassimilated fragment of ancient debate.[48] As it stands, this negative remark about John functions, by default, as a timely reminder of the fact that Jesus does perform signs.[49] More importantly, perhaps, it also reflects the interests of the 'many'

46. In an interesting article, Pierson Parker makes out a case that John described the Bethany referred to in 1.28 not as '*beyond the Jordan*, where John was baptizing' (so RSV; emphasis mine) but rather as '*across from the point of the Jordan where John had been baptizing*' (emphasis his). Thus, the Baptist's witness in 1.19-27 took place in the same Bethany John identifies as the home of Lazarus and his sisters in chapter 11 (see P. Parker, 'Bethany beyond Jordan', *JBL* 74 [1955], pp. 257-61 [258]). In Parker's favour is the fact that when John locates Jesus back at the place of baptism in 10.40, he does not name that place as Bethany. Nevertheless, this argument does oblige us to read exactly the same phrase in 1.28 and 10.40 (πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου) in two completely different ways depending on the verb. One wonders whether John's brand of *koine* was given to such precision.

47. See above in Chapter 2.

48. Commentators here generally refer us to E. Bammel's proposal that this comment on John reflects an earlier Jewish objection to the Christians' claim that the Baptist witnessed to their Messiah. However, not all find this argument persuasive; see esp. Lindars, *Gospel*, p. 378; *idem*, *Behind the Fourth Gospel*, p. 63; Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, II, p. 512 n. 140.

49. For the same technique in relation to the Baptist, see his 'confession', woodenly stressed in 1.20, that he is *not* the Christ (cf. 3.28). The emphasis in 1.20 is noted by Louw ('On Johannine Style', p. 8).

who have come to Jesus here. It is in this connection that the little comment in v. 42 comes into its own.

The expression πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτόν ('many believed in him') here describing the response of those who came to Jesus beyond the Jordan, is, in fact, one of a series of such comments which punctuates John's account of the public ministry. In previous occurrences, the faith of the 'many' has already been linked with witnessing the signs. This is explicit in 2.23: πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ θεωροῦντες αὐτοῦ τὰ σημεῖα ἃ ἐποίει ('many believed in his name when they saw the signs which he did'). Note also that the 'many' from the crowd who believe in 7.31 are impressed by the signs. Equally relevant is the fact that more than once these 'many' have been associated with 'the Jews'. This identification is clear at 8.30-31.[50] Note also that Nicodemus, 'a ruler of the Jews' (3.1), represents the 'many' who exhibit signs-faith in 2.23 (cf. 3.2). Similarly, 'the Jews' in 7.35, who puzzle over Jesus' words, are probably the 'many' in v. 31, whose interest in the signs prompts the authorities to act against Jesus (vv. 31-32). These previous associations[51] suggest that John's comment in 10.42 is not the throw-away remark it first seems. Rather, it has been carefully placed here to introduce a narrative which features 'Jews' (11.19), who show interest in Jesus' miraculous powers (v. 37) and who believe on witnessing the sign (v. 45). A glance ahead at similar statements confirms that it has this function. Note the expansion in 11.45: Πολλοὶ...ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων...θεασάμενοι ἃ ἐποίησεν ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτόν ('Many...of the Jews...having seen what he did, believed in him'), which also bears more than a passing resemblance to 2.23. Note also the version in 12.11: πολλοὶ...ὑπῆγον τῶν Ἰουδαίων καὶ ἐπίστευον εἰς τὸν Ἰησοῦν ('many...of the Jews were going away and believing in Jesus'), and the adverse reaction from the authorities in both cases (cf. 11.53; 12.10).[52] Thus, the 'many' in

50. Assuming the text as it stands. See above, Chapter 3 n. 15.

51. The exception here is where πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτόν applies to the Samaritans in 4.39. But then, in their case, they eventually come to full faith because of Jesus' word (vv. 41-42), a concept which very definitely meets with Johannine approval (see above, n. 25).

52. The last in this series of remarks comes at 12.42. Note again the threat from the authorities (Pharisees here), also the obvious link with the Nicodemus type (see above).

10.41-42 anticipates the appearance of the miracle-minded 'Jews' who will contribute to the furtherance of John's plot.

Introduction: Characters and Themes (11.1-4)

John now sets about introducing Lazarus to his readers. He does this with the minimum of disruption by the simple device of adding in the character to an already familiar context.[53] Thus, while he begins with a reference to Lazarus, once the word 'Bethany' passes the end of his pen he is all reminders: Bethany is the village of Mary and Martha (v. 1),[54] the same Mary who anointed Jesus' feet (v. 2). In fact, the only unknown quantity here is Lazarus.[55] The heavy-handed prompt in v. 2 reads oddly because, as the Gospel now stands, the actual event does not take place until the following chapter (12.1-8). Nevertheless, this is best regarded as a casualty of John's interpolation of the Lazarus story into an existing text rather than put down to the bungling intrusion of a later editor.[56] The obvious conclusion to draw here is that John's

53. See Lindars, *Gospel*, p. 385.

54. *Pace* Wilkens ('Erweckung', p. 27) and Schnackenburg (*Gospel*, II, p. 318), both of whom propose that the whole phrase 'Lazarus of Bethany' came from John's source for the miracle.

55. For this point, see esp. Culpepper, *Anatomy*, pp. 215-16; also Brown, *Gospel*, I, pp. 422-23.

56. When it comes to reminding his readers of characters and/or events, John is a born pedant; cf., e.g., 4.46; 7.50; 18.9, 32; 19.39; 21.20. Compare esp. 18.14, evidently added to help the reader place the unknown Annas (v. 13), and which uses the same construction as in the present verse. It seems that the chief objection to the authenticity of 11.2 is its reference to Jesus as ὁ κύριος, which John does not usually apply to Jesus in third person references until after the resurrection (see, e.g., Bultmann, *Gospel*, p. 395 n. 4; Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, II, p. 322; Brown, *Gospel*, I, p. 423; Lindars, *Gospel*, p. 387). Nevertheless, this consideration does not cover what John was capable of in a direct address to the reader which, for that reason, automatically assumes a post-resurrection standpoint. Note, moreover, that the reference here is consistent with the opening κύριε of the sisters' message in 11.3 (cf. also vv. 12, 21, 27, 32, 34, 39). Although, strictly speaking, this word could be translated simply as 'Sir', it is unlikely that John's Christian audience would have understood it in that restricted sense (see Brown, *Gospel*, I, p. 423; esp. Kremer, *Lazarus*, p. 54). Among commentators, Barrett (*Gospel*, p. 390), Beasley-Murray (*John*, p. 187) and Grayston (*Gospel*, p. 90) accept 11.2 as authentic. See also Lee, who dubs the idea of a later editor 'unnecessary' (*Symbolic Narratives*, p. 193 n. 3). The verse is retained as genuine by Gilbert van Belle in his detailed

readers already know a version of the anointing story which, to judge from the detail in v. 2, is not too dissimilar from what now emerges in chapter 12.[57] The point of the reference, as far as he is concerned, is not only to encourage his readers to associate the two stories but also to highlight Mary's role as the one who anointed Jesus for burial (cf. 12.7). This will become an important factor in the later scene in which the two meet (11.32-33). Meanwhile, John also has plans for Lazarus. Now 'adopted' into the Bethany family, Lazarus will become another means of ensuring the smooth flow of events in John's new narrative. As it proceeds, Lazarus will be discovered at table during the anointing (12.1-2)[58] and his presence there will account for the reappearance of the crowd of believing 'Jews' (12.9; cf. 11.45), by which time the stage is conveniently set for Jesus' triumphal entry into Jerusalem (12.12-19; cf. vv. 17-18). Thereafter we hear nothing more of Lazarus.[59]

At v. 3, the action begins and John moves quickly to introduce his themes. At a stroke, Lazarus's individuality is erased in favour of the role John has assigned to him. In the sisters' message to Jesus he becomes ὃν φιλεῖς, an early intimation that the tradition enshrined in 15.13 has come into play. Now Lazarus will represent all those who are

study, *Les parenthèses dans l'évangile de Jean: Aperçu historique et classification, texte grec de Jean* (SNTA, 11; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1985), see p. 84. Van Belle's observation that 11.3 contains the characteristically Johannine resumptive οὖν is especially telling (p. 119).

57. Since only in John's account are Mary and Martha linked with Bethany and the anointing of Jesus' feet, as here, it can scarcely be claimed that 11.2 has immediate reference to the Synoptic record. *Pace* F. Neirynck, 'L'epanalepsis et la critique littéraire: A propos de l'évangile de Jean', in F. van Segbroeck (ed.), *Evangelica: Gospel Studies–Etudes l'évangile. Collected Essays by Frans Neirynck* (BETL, 60; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1982), pp. 143-78 (163); also Davies, *Rhetoric and Reference*, p. 357-58; I.R. Kitzberger, 'Mary of Bethany and Mary of Magdala–Two Female Characters in the Johannine Passion Narrative: A Feminist, Narrative-Critical Reader-Response', *NTS* 41 (1995), pp. 564-86 (571-72); Sabbe, 'Anointing', p. 2072; and Thyen, 'Erzählung', pp. 2034-2035. Equally unworkable is Stibbe's suggestion that 11.2 was designed for the person rereading the Gospel; see Stibbe, 'Tomb', p. 52.

58. See esp. Lindars, *Gospel*, p. 381, on John's editorial activity in chapter 12.

59. Nothing, that is, until Robert Browning's 'not-incurious' physician happens upon an abstracted Lazarus in later life ('An Epistle containing the strange medical experience of Karshish, the Arab physician'). Can Browning be said to have filled a 'narrative gap'?

Jesus' φίλοι and for whom he gave his life.[60]

Jesus' reply in v. 4 is classically Johannine in idiom and theme.[61] Here our evangelist sets out his stall and declares his special interests for the benefit of his readers.[62] Typically, he begins with the negative: the illness, we learn, is not πρὸς θάνατον. Strictly speaking, this could be taken to mean that the illness will not lead to death. Yet it is quite clear from what follows that this is not how John intends it to be understood. Rather, the expression serves as the briefest indicator that the meaning of the sign concerns Jesus' assurance that those who hear his word have already passed from death to life (5.24; cf. 8.51, 52).[63] Moving on now to the positive, Jesus pronounces that the illness is for the glory of God. The sentiment here is akin to that in 9.3: this circumstance is a 'window of opportunity' for God to work.[64] Verbally, however, the reference to glory forms an *inclusio* with the first sign in chapter 2. On that occasion, according to John, Jesus revealed his glory—which is derived from God—and his disciples believed (2.11; cf. 1.14). Now this final sign will also disclose God's glory to the eye of faith, as Martha is soon to find out (11.40). The sentence closes with the purpose of the illness: it will be the means by which Jesus is brought to the cross.[65] This clarifies the hint in the previous verse about Lazarus's representative role. For love of his φίλος, Jesus will now go to his death.[66]

Delay (11.5-6)

This is surely one of the strangest moments in the entire Gospel. Instead of setting off immediately for Bethany, which is what we would

60. *Pace* Bultmann (*Gospel*, p. 395 n. 4), Wilkens ('Erweckung', p. 27), Schnackenburg (*Gospel*, II, p. 318), Fortna (*Gospel of Signs*, p. 77; *idem*, *Predecessor*, p. 94), and M.-E. Boismard ('Un procédé rédactionnel dans le quatrième évangile: La Wiederaufnahme', in M. de Jonge [ed.], *L'évangile de Jean: Sources, rédaction, théologie* [BETL, 44; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1977], pp. 235-41 [239]), all of whom take the wording of the sisters' message as original to John's source.

61. All source-critics consulted are in agreement on this.

62. So Bultmann, *Gospel*, p. 397 n. 5; Kremer, *Lazarus*, p. 55.

63. See above Chapter 3.

64. See esp. the comment by Barrett that 'the glory of God is not his praise, but his activity' (*Gospel*, p. 390).

65. The title 'Son of God' is possibly derived from 5.25. See above, Chapter 3.

66. See above, Chapter 2.

expect, Jesus stays where he is for two more days. No explanation is offered for this. There is only the general assurance in v. 5 of Jesus' affection for the whole family, which looks designed to ward off any suggestion that his behaviour in v. 6 was due to indifference.[67] Needless to say, this lack of clarification on the evangelist's part has been amply remedied by a variety of theories from commentators. Some attribute the delay to the influence of the Old Testament on John, although suggestions vary as to the precise passage he had in mind.[68] Others see this as evidence that John's source for the miracle already contained a sequence of days, but fail to agree on whether or not that source actually contained v. 6.[69] A third approach, which is by far the most popular, is to place this inaction in the context of John's general presentation of Jesus as one who works entirely at God's prompting. Thus, the implication here is that Jesus' movements are not ultimately determined by human timetables but by the divine will.[70] This suggestion is worked out in detail by C.H. Giblin, who sees this passage as conforming to a Johannine pattern in which Jesus responds

67. For this point, see Brown, *Gospel*, I, p. 423; Barrett, *Gospel*, p. 390; Kremer, *Lazarus*, p. 57.

68. According to Aileen Guilding, the two days' delay is to fulfil Hos. 6.1-2 (*The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship: A Study of the Relation of St. John's Gospel to the Ancient Jewish Lectionary System* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960], p. 151). Hanson, however, detects the influence of Job 14.6 ('Old Testament Background', p. 252), while Scott argues for the influence of Wisdom on John's Christology (*Sophia*, p. 200).

69. The view that the two days comes from John's source is held by Bultmann (*Gospel*, p. 398) and Nicol (*Sēmeia*, p. 37). It is also argued by Boismard on the basis of the *Wiederaufnahme* in v. 6a ('Un procédé rédactionnel', p. 239). Nevertheless, it is not clear that this resumptive technique denotes anything more than a digressive style of narration on John's part (see the points in Neirynck, 'L'epanalepsis', pp. 175, 178). For the opposing view that the source actually contained the reference to *four* days in v. 17 and that the two days in v. 6 was inserted by John, see Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, II, pp. 318, 324 and Fortna, *Predecessor*, pp. 99, 105 n. 234.

70. Variations of this view are proposed by Barrett (*Gospel*, p. 391), Beasley-Murray (*John*, p. 188), Brown (*Gospel*, I, p. 431), Bultmann (*Gospel*, p. 398), Lee (*Symbolic Narratives*, p. 199), Nicol (*Sēmeia*, p. 60), Schnackenburg (*Gospel*, II, p. 324 and Stibbe ('Tomb', p. 44). See also T.E. Pollard, 'The Raising of Lazarus', in E.A. Livingstone (ed.), *Studia Evangelica*, VI (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, 112; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1973), pp. 434-43 (438).

positively following a negative reaction.[71] As an attempt to explain a difficult text in purely Johannine terms, this third argument has much to recommend it. Nevertheless, with so little to go on in the verses in question, it remains uncertain how far such lofty considerations have weighed with John at this point. In fact, the 'apologetic' v. 5 strongly suggests that he saw the two days' delay as a possible stumbling-block for his readers rather than as part of a pattern they would recognize. This raises the possibility that his real concerns were rather more specific to the narrative in hand.

In fact, this two-day interval may be nothing more profound than a case of 'running repairs'. For his own purposes, our evangelist has prepared for this story by placing Jesus across the Jordan where John had baptized (10.40). Now, having outlined the urgency of the situation and alerted his readers to the meaning of the sign, he begins to work towards the point where Jesus reaches Bethany. In the process, he will draw out the implications of Jesus' return to Judaea (11.7-16) and will bring Martha to the fore in anticipation of her meeting with Jesus on his arrival at the village (v. 5, cf. 20-27).[72] There is one factor, however, that he must cater for at all costs. It is crucial to the credibility of John's raising miracle that Lazarus be dead four days by the time Jesus reaches him. With Bethany only a day's journey away, John must literally make time for Jesus in his narrative. Counting inclusively, two days is the minimum delay possible to allow the situation in v. 17 to develop.[73]

Call to Martyrdom (11.7-16)

John now turns to consider the implications for faith of Jesus' advance into personal danger for love of Lazarus.[74] Accordingly, this section of the narrative will feature Jesus in dialogue with the disciples. Jesus' proposal that the company return to Judaea sets the agenda (v. 7). The disciples' response is a grim reminder of the recent threat to Jesus' life

71. C.H. Giblin, 'Suggestion, Negative Response, and Positive Action in St John's Portrayal of Jesus (John 2.1-11; 4.46-54.; 7.2-14.; 11.1-44.)', *NTS* 26 (1980), pp. 197-211 (199-200, 208-211).

72. As noted by Schnackenburg (*Gospel*, II, p. 318), Nicol (*Sēmeia*, p. 37), Fortna (*Predecessor*, pp. 99, 105) and Kitzberger ('Mary of Bethany', p. 573).

73. On this point, see esp. Lindars, *Gospel*, p. 388.

74. For the argument of this paragraph, see above Chapter 2.

(v. 8, cf. 10.31-33) and this at once raises the issue of their own commitment to his mission. The parable which follows is modelled on 9.4-5 and forms one of a series of exhortations to walk in the light shed by Jesus, which is a feature of this part of the Gospel (vv. 9-10; cf. 8.12; 12.35, 46). Placed here it functions to encourage those who continue Jesus' ministry in the world to remain true to their calling in times of peril. It is against this backdrop that John intends Jesus' description of Lazarus as ὁ φίλος ἡμῶν in v. 11 to make its mark. This is a direct reference to the tradition in 15.13.[75] It not only establishes that Lazarus is the φίλος for whom Jesus will give his life but it also serves to bond the disciples together with Jesus in a common cause. John's message is clear: the Christian commitment to live in imitation of Jesus is to be prepared to place life at risk to do God's work.

However, this is not the full measure of what John intends to convey to his readers in v. 11. If Jesus' opening words strike a sombre note, the remainder of the sentence is designed to sweeten the pill with a glimpse of hope. Jesus tells the disciples that Lazarus has fallen asleep and that he is going to Bethany to awaken him. The reference to sleep is a common euphemism for death, which was well known in early Christian circles. Thus, the implication is that Jesus will bring Lazarus back to life and this will be a token of the deeper truth that he will raise the faithful dead to eternal life at the eschaton. I have already argued that John has drawn this language of sleeping and waking from Dan. 12.2.[76] Nevertheless, the amount of painstaking explanation he has evidently been put to by including it (cf. vv. 12-14) suggests that he may not have had an entirely free hand in the matter. Commentators usually recognize a parallel here with Jesus' pronouncement on Jairus's daughter at Mk 5.39: τὸ παιδίον οὐκ ἀπέθανεν ἀλλὰ καθεύδει.[77] In fact, the parallel is easily extended if we put Jesus' reference to sleep in Jn 11.11 together with his description in v. 4 of the illness as οὐ πρὸς θάνατον which, taken at face value, is also a denial of death. In other words, I suggest that there is evidence here of a 'johannized' version of

75. Thus, this description was not taken from John's source for the miracle, *pace* Bultmann, *Gospel*, p. 398 n. 3; Fortna, *Gospel of Signs*, p. 79 and *idem*, *Predecessor*, p. 94, cf. his pp. 100, 105.

76. For this argument, and the points made in this paragraph so far, see above, Chapter 3.

77. See, e.g., Barrett, *Gospel*, p. 392; Brown, *Gospel*, I, p. 432; Bultmann, *Gospel*, p. 399 n. 6; Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, II, p. 326.

Mk 5.39 which is now applied to Lazarus.[78] I also suggest that the second element of this logion was the starting point for John's formulation of 11.11. Having already incorporated the reference to death in the programmatic v. 4, John now uses Jesus' 'correction' that death is as sleep—which he (John) cannot afford to be misunderstood—as a means of breaking the news at this point about Lazarus's actual condition. However, he has not left matters at that. In a passage which dwells on the grim duty of following Jesus to the cross, John has also sought to point beyond death to the Christian hope of resurrection to life at the end of the age. With the help of Dan. 12.2, already to hand in the scriptural backdrop to the Lazarus story, he can extend the metaphor positively and achieve his goal.[79]

It is now the disciples' turn to play the leaden-witted stooge (v. 12). This familiar Johannine role is often assigned to 'the Jews' during the course of the public ministry. Nevertheless, it is by no means confined to them and, if need be, any character or group on the scene at the time can be pressed into service.[80] On this occasion, the misunderstanding creates the opportunity for John to eradicate any ambiguity as to Jesus' real meaning about Lazarus (vv. 13-14). Once this is achieved, however, the mood is lightened again as thoughts are projected beyond the immediate circumstance: Lazarus's death in Jesus' absence is a matter

78. This need not mean, of course, that John took the logion directly from Mark's story. Note, however, John's untypical use of σώζειν to mean 'heal' in the immediate context (v. 12); cf. Mk 5.23, 34.

79. See above, Chapter 3.

80. For a thorough discussion of misunderstandings in John, including a survey of scholarship, see Culpepper, *Anatomy*, pp. 152-65. According to Jeffrey Staley, Jesus' reference to sleep in v. 11 is an example of the narrator's victimization of the implied reader, whose assumption that Lazarus is getting better, confirmed by the disciples' response in v. 12, is then corrected by the narrator in v. 13. Similarly, the implied reader's assumption that there is only one Bethany, i.e. beyond the Jordan, is corrected by the withheld geographical reference at v. 18. See J.L. Staley, *The Print's First Kiss: A Rhetorical Investigation of the Implied Reader in the Fourth Gospel* (SBLDS, 82; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988), pp. 105-107. Staley's approach is naïve and completely implausible. It is naïve in that it takes a perfectionist approach to the text which leaves no room for inconsistency or error on the part of the narrator. It is completely implausible because of the absurdity of supposing that John's text was designed to play cat and mouse with the reader in such a manner. As vv. 13-14 amply demonstrate, John was intent on clarification, not obfuscation, and certainly not chicanery.

for rejoicing because it will provide an occasion for the disciples to believe (v. 15a). The precise nature of that belief will soon be expounded by Jesus to the faithful Martha (vv. 25-26) and she will be prompted to recall that teaching in the final stages before Lazarus is returned to life (v. 40).

With the repeated ἄγωμεν from v. 7, John draws the pericope to a close (v. 15b), leaving Thomas's exhortation to his fellow-disciples as a last ringing call to his readers to take the martyr's path with Jesus (v. 16).[81] Even here, however, John has sought to soften the blow by guiding their thoughts towards future promise. His choice of Thomas as the speaker at this point is surely far from random. If we grant that the Lazarus story is a late addition to the Gospel, then almost certainly John's readers will already know about Thomas. Never the most perspicacious of John's characters (cf. 14.5), Thomas finally distinguishes himself by stolidly refusing to believe in the resurrection of Jesus short of handling the evidence (20.24-29). In other words, John's speaker in 11.16 comes with a history.[82] Drawn from a resurrection scenario but unable to believe the report, Thomas is surely the least qualified of the disciples to see matters in the round as far as the true Christian is concerned. Given their awareness of his character, and given the hints of more to come already contained in this passage, John's readers are unlikely to accept Thomas's limited vision as the last word on the matter.

Life-Giver (11.17-27)

The scene now changes to Bethany, which is where the miracle will take place. With that in mind, John ensures that the situation Jesus encounters on arrival already contains certain details which will tell in the event (vv. 17-19). First, it is essential that Lazarus be found dead beyond any hope of resuscitation according to the conventions of the day.[83] On this datum hinges the reality of John's raising miracle and hence its potential as a σημεῖον of Jesus' power to raise the faithful dead to eternal life. In fact, John has already gone to some unusual

81. On this verse and Thomas as speaker, see above, Chapter 2.

82. On this point, see esp. Lindars, *Gospel*, p. 392.

83. According to Jewish sources, death was irreversible after three days; see esp. Brown, *Gospel*, I, p. 424. *Pace* Nicol (*Sēmeia*, p. 60), the Jewishness of this detail is hardly sufficient grounds for assigning it to John's miracle source rather than to John himself.

lengths to preserve this four-day interval (see above). Second, it is important to refer to the death in terms of an actual entombment. In order for the miracle to signify what John intends, it is essential that Lazarus's revival takes the form of an emergence from the tomb. Third, for editorial reasons it is necessary for a gathering of 'the Jews' to be present (vv. 18-19). The geographical detail in v. 18 is designed to indicate the ease with which such a crowd could appear on the Bethany scene and possibly also to alert the reader to Jesus' nearness to Jerusalem and death.[84] These 'Jews' are John's miracle-mad variety, whose enthusiastic witness to the raising will lend continuity to his narrative in this chapter and the next (see above).[85]

The arrangement which follows is pure artifice. Having begun by describing the situation on Jesus' arrival at Bethany, John now backtracks to the point where Jesus has not yet reached the village but lingers on the road to meet the two sisters separately (vv. 20-37, cf. v. 30).[86] John's purpose here is to produce two discrete blocks of material, each of which is devoted to one of the two main themes this chapter is designed to illustrate. With Mary's role as intuitive anointer already established (cf. v. 2), it falls to the active and articulate Martha to be the recipient of Jesus' teaching on his powers to give life. Accordingly, having once again listed Martha ahead of her sister (v. 19, cf. v. 5), John sends her off to meet Jesus, leaving Mary sitting in the house (v. 20).[87]

Martha's first words to Jesus, which will later be echoed by her sister, draw attention to the fact that he was absent during Lazarus's fatal illness (v. 21, cf. v. 32). Although this remark could be construed as a reproach, it is unlikely that John intended it to be taken as such.[88] In fact, this is simply another means of pressing home the point that

84. This double point is made by Barrett (*Gospel*, p. 394). There is no need to insist that all geographical detail must come from John's source, *pace* Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, II, pp. 319, 329; note Fortna's growing doubts on this in *Predecessor*, pp. 94, 100.

85. This function is recognized by Fortna (*Predecessor*, p. 101) and by Beasley-Murray (*John*, p. 190).

86. On the contrived nature of John's narrative here, see Lindars, *Gospel*, p. 393; Bultmann, *Gospel*, p. 405 n. 4.

87. There is more than a touch of the Lukan presentation of Mary here (cf. Lk. 10.38-39). The comparison is also drawn by Lindars (*Gospel*, p. 393), Fortna (*Predecessor*, p. 106) and Brown (*Gospel*, I, p. 433).

88. *Pace* Pollard, 'Raising', pp. 438-39.

Jesus was not there to cure the illness, a situation which John has deliberately engineered and has already presented as grounds for faith (10.40; 11.14-15). Martha continues with the certainty that God will grant Jesus whatever he asks (v. 22). The certainty consists in the fact that her words are an application to Jesus of the 'ask, and it will be given' logion from tradition.[89] This forms a link with the maxim on prayer in the previous sign (9.31) and also prepares the ground for Jesus' own prayer of thanksgiving later in the chapter (vv. 41-42). For the present, Martha's words introduce an appropriate attitude of trust in Jesus' God-given powers and so serve as a convenient point of entry into the main subject-matter of the interview. This comes into focus in the following verse.

Jesus' assurance to Martha that her brother will rise again is capable of more than one interpretation (v. 23).[90] On the one hand, it could mean that Lazarus will be returned to life, which is what eventually happens. On the other, however, it could mean that Lazarus will be raised at the eschaton, which is the sense in which Martha now takes it (cf. v. 24). In the event, of course, both meanings will be seen to apply because the miracle itself will convey the promise of resurrection. For now, however, John concentrates on eschatology.

Martha's future-orientated conviction about her brother in v. 24 relies on a common assumption within Judaism at the time which John himself does not dispute. Jesus' reply in vv. 25-26 does not reject Martha's viewpoint but extends it from the familiar Johannine perspective where present and future are held together through the figure of Jesus as life-giver.[91] As we have seen, the 'I am' statement and the magnificent word-play which follows it have been carefully crafted out of earlier, tradition-based material in chapters 5 and 8.[92]

Asked if she believes this teaching, Martha gives her assent in full measure (v. 27). Here John draws on his community's confessional material to present Martha as the ideal of Johannine faith.[93] In fact, so

89. As argued above, see Chapter 4.

90. See further Lindars, *Gospel*, p. 394; Ponthot, 'La methode', p. 99.

91. *Pace* Bultmann, *Gospel*, p. 402. See rather, Beasley-Murray, *John*, p. 190; Scott, *Sophia*, p. 201.

92. See above, chapter 3.

93. Bultmann is worth quoting on this: 'It is incomprehensible how many exegetes can say that Martha did not rightly understand Jesus. Dibelius is right in affirming that v. 27 is the christological confession of the Church' (*Gospel*, p. 404

extensive is her response that this is the only occasion in the entire Gospel where John puts these three titles all together. The first two are fairly standard Johannine fare and are linked again by John in his own statement of purpose in 20.31.[94] The addition of the third, however, which is really more of a messianic description than a title,[95] has probably been done with an eye to neighbouring material. The expression ὁ...ἐρχόμενος, used here and in 6.14 with reference to Jesus' mission to the world, is derived from Ps. 118.26. According to the Gospel tradition, this scripture was applied to Jesus by others, most notably by the crowd on his triumphal entry into Jerusalem (Mk 11.9 par.).[96] John is well aware of that tradition. Indeed, at this stage he has already reproduced it in his own account of Jesus' entry into the city which is now in the following chapter (12.12-19). Given his general intention to present the material in chapters 11 and 12 as a unit, it is entirely possible that the psalm reference to Jesus as ὁ ἐρχόμενος in 12.13 has prompted his choice of the third element in Martha's confession in the present narrative. In fact, this is not the last of the influence of Ps. 118 on the Lazarus story. When Jesus and Martha meet again, Jesus' prayer will actually quote from this psalm (v. 41).[97]

n. 5). One such exegete today is Brown (*Gospel*, pp. 433-35), although in *Community* (pp. 190-91), he has apparently revised this opinion. See also J.N. Sanders's description of Martha as 'the bustling, managing type, good-hearted, conventionally pious, but limited in imagination' (' "Those whom Jesus Loved" (John xi. 5)', *NTS* 1 [1954–55], pp. 29-41 [41]). In general, however, today's critics, especially those with feminist interests, take Martha seriously as the model for full Johannine faith. See esp. E. Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins* (London: SCM Press, 1983), pp. 329-30; S.M. Schneiders, 'Women in the Fourth Gospel and the Role of Women in the Contemporary Church', in M.W.G. Stibbe (ed.), *The Gospel of John as Literature: An Anthology of Twentieth-Century Perspectives (NTTS, 17; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1993)*, pp. 123-43 (135-36). See also Culpepper, *Anatomy*, pp. 141, 142; Scott, *Sophia*, pp. 202, 204-205; Stibbe, 'Tomb', p. 47.

94. For other Gospel references, see above, Chapter 4 n. 17. Compare also 1 Jn 1.3; 2.22; 3.23; 5.20, etc.

95. On this point, see Beasley-Murray, *John*, p. 192; Ashton, *Understanding*, p. 254 n. 29.

96. See esp. the discussion on references to Jesus as ὁ ἐρχόμενος in the Synoptics, John and elsewhere in the New Testament in J.K. Elliott, 'Is ὁ ἐξελθών a Title for Jesus in Mark i. 45?', *JTS* NS 27 (1976), pp. 402-405.

97. See above, Chapter 4.

'All Change' (11.28-31)

This is little more than a piece of stage management. The object here is to replace Martha with Mary in preparation for a change of theme and also to bring 'the Jews' to the scene at the graveside so that they will witness the miracle.

In v. 28, Martha informs her sister about Jesus but does so privately (λάθρᾳ). John offers no explanation for this secretive behaviour, a difficulty which leaves commentators free to speculate. Some suggest that Martha was seeking to conceal the news of Jesus' presence from 'the Jews' in a dangerous situation.[98] This is not an impossible thought given what results from the response of 'the Jews' to the miracle later in the chapter (vv. 45-53). Nevertheless, there is no suggestion by John at this point that 'the Jews' are a potential threat to Jesus' safety.[99] Another possibility raised is that Martha meant to get Mary away from 'the Jews' for a private conversation with Jesus.[100] However, when these two meet, there is nothing to imply that 'the Jews' play gooseberry on what was otherwise meant as a private scene (vv. 32-37). In fact, the whole point of the exercise, as far as John is concerned, is to provide an excuse in his narrative for 'the Jews' to follow Mary. He has already informed his readers that they have come to Bethany to console the sisters in their loss (v. 19). By keeping 'the Jews' ignorant of the real purpose of Mary's exit from the house, he can use their commiserating intentions as a reason for their decision to join Mary at the tomb and thus have them arrive on the scene of her meeting with Jesus (v. 31).[101]

Martha's actual words to Mary and her sister's response (vv. 28-29) are reminiscent of a number of passages in the Gospel and elsewhere. For example, it has not gone unnoticed that the reference to Jesus as teacher and to Mary hearing his call is evocative of Luke's picture of her as the model disciple (Lk. 10.39).[102] Note also that in the raising of Jairus's daughter, Jesus is spoken of as the teacher not to be troubled

98. See, e.g., Brown, *Gospel*, I, p. 425; Lee, *Symbolic Narratives*, p. 201.

99. So Barrett, *Gospel*, p. 397.

100. So Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, II, pp. 333-34; Beasley-Murray, *John*, p. 192.

101. As Lindars puts it, 'John's object is to bring the whole company to the graveside' (*Gospel*, p. 397).

102. See Lindars, *Gospel*, p. 397; Fortna, *Predecessor*, p. 102.

(Mk 5.35; Lk. 8.49). Closer to home, perhaps, is the resurrection scene in Jn 20.11-18 where another Mary weeps outside Jesus' tomb (v. 11, cf. 11.31) and addresses him as teacher (v. 16).[103] Surely even closer, however, is the imagery John has already associated with resurrection in chapter 5. Barrett raises the interesting possibility that John's word πάρεστιν in 11.28 could be intended to remind the reader of the παρουσία of the Son of man when the dead will be raised. Barrett himself does not pursue the matter and even omits to make the obvious reference to the scene in 5.27-29.[104] Nevertheless, this suggestion is well worth investigating further. According to John in 11.28-29, Martha told her sister that Jesus was present (πάρεστιν) and was calling her (καὶ φωνεῖ σε), at which point Mary heard (ἤκουσεν) and quickly rose (ἠγέρθη). In chapter 5 we learn that Jesus is empowered by the Father, who raises (ἐγείρει) the dead and gives life (v. 21, cf. v. 26), and that those who now hear Jesus' word (ὁ τὸν λόγον μου ἀκούων) (v. 24) will also hear his voice (ἀκούσουσιν τῆς φωνῆς) at the eschaton and come forth to the resurrection of life (vv. 25, 28-29).[105] Perhaps, then, John's choice of terms in the present passage has been to a purpose and Barrett's point can be supported. Could it be that John has deliberately turned this small corner of his narrative into a hint, in the person of Mary, of the glory to be seen in the raising miracle to come?[106] If we grant this, then Mary is indeed the model disciple who faithfully rises at Jesus' call and comes forth to the giver of life.

Life Given (11.32-37)

Now that Jesus and Mary are finally to meet, John turns his attention to his second main theme from tradition. In harmony with Jesus' own definition of love in 15.13, John will show him in the conscious process of laying down his life for Lazarus his φίλος.

The atmosphere here is heavy with emotion. On seeing Jesus, Mary casts herself at his feet in an impassioned gesture of devotion (v. 32).[107]

103. Note esp. Lindars's point that Mary here is a blend of the Lukan figure and John's own presentation of Mary Magdalene (*Gospel*, p. 397).

104. See Barrett, *Gospel*, p. 397.

105. Note also that the faithful sheep hear Jesus' voice in 10.3.

106. See Lazarus's response on hearing Jesus' φωνῇ μεγάλῃ in 11.43-44. Note the continued application to Lazarus of the verbs ἐγείρειν and φωνεῖν (12.1, 9, 17).

107. For this gesture, Lindars refers us not only to Lk. 10.39 but also to Mary

Her words are a repeat of those first uttered by Martha in the previous interview (cf. v. 21). This parallel is at once a reminder of that earlier conversation and a signal that John's narrative will now take a new turn.[108] This change is immediately obvious from the description which follows of Jesus' response to Mary's presence. In v. 33 we learn that the sight of Mary's grief and that of 'the Jews' accompanying her releases within Jesus a charge of emotion of overwhelming intensity. Such inner anguish is scarcely explicable as grief at the demise of a friend. In fact, as I have already suggested, this is John's depiction of Jesus' agony in Gethsemane at the thought of his own approaching death.[109] The time has now come to discuss this text in detail.

In v. 33, John describes Jesus' emotion in the following terms: ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι καὶ ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτόν ('he was deeply moved in spirit and troubled'). This expression is notoriously difficult to interpret and the crux of the matter lies with John's use of ἐμβριμᾶσθαι in this context. He clearly expects the two phrases, ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι and ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτόν, to be taken synonymously. Moreover, the meaning he attaches to ταράσσειν is easily established from his application of it to Jesus in the context of the Passion. Thus, at 12.27, John's rendering of Jesus' Gethsemane prayer begins Νῦν ἡ ψυχή μου τετάρακται ('Now is my soul troubled') (cf. Mt. 26.38; Mk 14.34); similarly, at the point where Jesus predicts his betrayal, John tells us that he was 'troubled in spirit' (ἐταράχθη τῷ πνεύματι) (13.21).[110] This is good evidence to suggest that the language of inner turmoil in 11.33 is another Johannine version of the profound distress which gripped Jesus as the hour of his death

Magdalene's action on recognizing Jesus in 20.16-17, suggesting that this link between the two narratives would account for the unnecessary 'and saw him' in the present text (*Gospel*, p. 397). It may be more than coincidence, however, that Mary's whole action here, sight and all, matches exactly Mark's description of Jairus's first response to Jesus in 5.22. On Mary's gesture as a sign of devotion, see esp. Kremer, *Lazarus*, p. 72.

108. On this function, see Lindars, *Gospel*, p. 397. Thus, the fact that Mary does not add Martha's certainty about Jesus at prayer (cf. v. 22) is due to the needs of John's narrative and is not intended to suggest any failure in faith on her part, *pace* Pollard, 'Raising', p. 441; Bultmann, *Gospel*, p. 406; Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, II, p. 333. Pollard's argument is successfully refuted by Scott (*Sophia*, p. 206).

109. See above, Chapter 2.

110. On the remaining uses of ταράσσειν in John, see esp. Barrett, *Gospel*, p. 399.

drew near. The difficulty here is that the verb ἐμβριμᾶσθαι, which John never uses outside this passage, does not comply with this meaning. As the lexical evidence attests, this rare word is an expression of anger.[111]

But why should Jesus be angry? There is wide agreement that this must be the case.[112] Nevertheless, problems arise when it comes to identifying the possible cause. For example, it is suggested by some that Jesus is enraged because the weeping of Mary and/or 'the Jews' (v. 33) shows a lack of faith in his powers to give life.[113] However, this is open to the objection that neither Mary nor the mourning party is presented here in a negative light. Furthermore, the weeping can scarcely indicate faithlessness since Jesus himself also weeps (v. 35).[114] Another suggestion is that Jesus' anger is kindled by the fact of death as representing the power of Satan.[115] However, there is no reference to Satan in this context and, in any case, this solution fails to meet John's specification that Jesus' emotion was at the sight of the mourners themselves.[116] A further point which tells against both proposals is that the words τῷ πνεύματι and ἑαυτόν clearly indicate that Jesus' agitation is internal, a vexation of soul rather than an aggression towards others, demonic or otherwise, on the scene at the time.[117] Thus, if anger this be, then it seems that Jesus was angry with himself.[118] Even so, however, the difficulty of finding evidence in John's text to support such a reading remains. In that connection, Cullen Story's recent suggestion that Jesus was momentarily reproaching himself for not having come to Bethany sooner is breathtakingly naïve and about as remote as it is possible to get from Johannine thinking.[119]

111. See Barrett, *Gospel*, p. 399; Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, II, p. 335; Beasley-Murray, *John*, p. 193. See esp. the evidence given in C.I.K. Story, 'The Mental Attitude of Jesus at Bethany: John 11.33, 38', *NTS* 37 (1991), pp. 51-66, and in Lindars, 'Rebuking'.

112. See the comprehensive survey in Lee, *Symbolic Narratives*, p. 209 n.3.

113. See Pollard, 'Raising', p. 441; Bultmann, *Gospel*, I, p. 406; Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, II, p. 336; Beasley-Murray, *John*, p. 193.

114. For these points, see Barrett, *Gospel*, p. 398; Brown, *Gospel*, I, p. 435; Scott, *Sophia*, p. 206.

115. See esp. Brown, *Gospel*, I, p. 435.

116. For these points, see Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, II, p. 336; Lee, *Symbolic Narratives*, p. 210; Barrett, *Gospel*, p. 398.

117. On this, see esp. Kremer, *Lazarus*, p. 72; Lee, *Symbolic Narratives*, p. 210.

118. See esp. Moule, '"Life"', p. 119 n. 1

119. See Story, 'Mental Attitude', pp. 64-66. For other criticisms of Story's

It is the great strength of Barnabas Lindars's position on this that he recognizes that ἐμβριμᾶσθαι, when taken in its Johannine context, cannot be interpreted as anger.[120] He argues this on the grounds that John himself has glossed the verb in such a way as to alter its meaning to an expression of grief. The fact of this editorial shift together with the rarity of the verb lead Lindars to suppose that ἐμβριμᾶσθαι was drawn from the underlying source John used for the miracle.[121] From his own survey of the usage of the verb and cognates in texts outside the New Testament, he concludes that it refers to an aggressive style of behaviour rather than to anger as such and notes its association with the idea of administering a rebuke. Moving on to the New Testament he first points to an example of this in Mark's version of the anointing at Bethany (Mk 14.5). There Mark employs the normal construction of the verb with dative of person to record the fact that some bystanders, angry at the waste of expensive ointment, rebuked the woman (ἐνεβριμῶντο αὐτῇ). Turning next to the reference in Mk 1.43, Lindars argues the case that Mark's harsh description of Jesus as sternly admonishing the healed leper (ἐμβριμησάμενος αὐτῷ) is really a displaced exorcism phrase. By comparing other evidence in Mark's text, he reasons that Mark's source for the miracle was an exorcism story in which Jesus rebuked the unclean spirit but that, in order to promote his theme of the messianic secret, Mark himself transferred that material to an address by Jesus to the cured man. Meanwhile, the similar address to the two blind men in Mt. 9.30 poses no problems

approach, see Lindars, 'Rebuking', p. 187 n. 8; Lee, *Symbolic Narratives*, p. 209 n. 3. Other attempts to explain the text include Matthew Black's proposal that the two expressions ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι and ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτόν are translation variants of an Aramaic original (M. Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 3rd edn, 1967], pp. 240-43). This has not found wide acceptance, see esp. Barrett, *Gospel*, pp. 399-400; Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, II, p. 516 n. 51; Beasley-Murray, *John*, p. 193. The well-attested alternative reading, ἐταράχθη τῷ πνεύματι ὡς ἐμβριμούμενος, is clearly an early scribal attempt to 'improve' the text by softening its effect (see esp. Barrett, *Gospel*, p. 399).

120. See esp. Lindars, 'Rebuking', pp. 184, 186, 196-97; *idem*, *Gospel*, p. 398.

121. See Lindars, 'Rebuking', p. 186; *idem*, *Gospel*, p. 398; *idem*, *Behind the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 57, 59. Lindars is not alone in this supposition, see also Wilkens, 'Erweckung', p. 27; Bultmann, *Gospel*, p. 406 n. 3; Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, II, p. 319; Fortna, *Gospel of Signs*, p. 86; *idem*, *Predecessor*, pp. 94-95; Nicol, *Sēmeia*, p. 38; Beasley-Murray, *John*, p. 193. The remainder of the present paragraph will concentrate on the argument in Lindars's article.

because Matthew took this directly from Mark's text. On the basis of this argument, Lindars proposes that the material John drew from his source in 11.33 was not only ἐμβριμᾶσθαι but the whole phrase ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι which, in its original context, meant 'he rebuked the spirit'. Thus, John's source for the Lazarus miracle, like Mark's for the healing of the leper, was an exorcism story. Lindars suggests that the story itself probably most nearly resembled the exorcism of the epileptic boy in Mk 9.14-29. This is because some of the detail Mark reports there, including the command to the spirit, the loud voice, the raising of the boy and the prayer reference, is also present in John's text where it has received a different orientation.

As we would expect, Lindars's argument is learned, imaginative and ingenious. It is also almost certainly mistaken. There are several reasons for this. To begin with, it is highly unlikely that John would have sought to pass off an exorcism story in his tradition as a raising miracle. To do so would surely damage the credibility of his story and thus cast doubt on the reality of the σάρξ in this case in which he intends his readers to see the δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ. Lindars attempts to ward off this objection by claiming, on the basis of some of the detail in Mark's tale about the epileptic boy, that exorcism had already been compared with raising from death in Christian catechesis.[122] This suggestion is not unreasonable. Equally, however, we have only Lindars's word that this was so. Second, Lindars's theory rests on his proposal that the whole phrase ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι was taken by John from his source. Yet a glance at the parallel statement ἐταράχθη τῷ πνεύματι in 13.21 quickly demonstrates that τῷ πνεύματι, used adverbially here as in 11.33, was part of John's normal vocabulary. There is thus nothing to compel us to suppose that John's source contained any reference to *spirit*. Third, Lindars supports his case by claiming that certain elements in John's account are evidence that he has adapted a source which resembled the story in Mk 9.14-29. Nevertheless, as this study has shown, there is not one detail he mentions whose presence in John's text cannot be explained by other means.[123] Fourth, Lindars's argument proceeds by virtually ignoring the fact that ἐμβριμᾶσθαι occurs in Mark's version of the anointing at

122. See 'Rebuking', p. 194.

123. For the dialogue between Jesus and Martha, the command to Lazarus to come out of the tomb, the loud voice and the emergence of Lazarus from the tomb, see above, Chapter 3; for the prayer, see above, Chapter 4.

Bethany (14.5) which, on other grounds, John evidently knew very well. In a revealing little footnote, Lindars picks up on this reference, indicating his awareness that the anointing tradition has contributed to the Lazarus story. Amazingly, he then adds, 'But it seems to me very unlikely that he [John] would take the word from this source and substitute it for ἐπιτιμᾶν in the exorcism story'.[124] Note that his exorcism story is now a reality sufficiently concrete to form the basis of an argument to reject another option! This leads us to the final objection, which is that there is no actual evidence in the Gospel tradition as it stands that such a source ever existed. Instead, we are offered a hypothesis built on conjecture about the complexion of the materials behind the texts. This does not automatically mean that Lindars's proposal is false. Equally, however, it must be said that one displaced word in Mark is a slender thread on which to hang a thesis.

If we are to make any progress with this problem, it seems safest to work with the evidence that we actually have. We know that Mark used ἐμβριμᾶσθαι in his story of the anointing at Bethany. We also know from simple observation that John's own account in 12.1-8 was heavily influenced either by Mark's text or by something strikingly like it. Let us begin there.

According to Mark, Jesus was reclining at table in the house of Simon the leper when an unnamed woman came in and poured costly ointment over his head (14.3). At this point, we are told that some people were angered within themselves (τινες ἀγανακτοῦντες πρὸς ἑαυτούς)[125] and complained about the waste of ointment (v. 4) because it could have been sold for a great deal of money to the benefit of the poor. Mark then attributes a second expression of anger to these bystanders, this time directed towards the anointer in a vehement rebuke (καὶ ἐνεβριμῶντο αὐτῇ) (v. 5).

For the most part, John's account of the anointing appears to

124. 'Rebuking', pp. 194-95 n. 28.

125. The πρὸς ἑαυτούς here can be read as either 'within themselves' or 'among themselves' depending on whether it is taken to represent the Aramaic ethical dative. See BAGD, p. 4; R.H. Gundry, *Mark: A Commentary on his Apology for the Cross* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), p. 810. For a discussion of the implications of this idiom in Hebrew and Aramaic, see T. Muraoka, 'On the So-called *Dativus Ethicus* in Hebrew', *JTS* NS 29 (1978), pp. 495-98. I am indebted to Dr J.L. North for this reference.

resemble Mark's, often to the point of close verbal correspondence.[126] Unlike Mark, however, he identifies the woman who anointed Jesus as Mary, Martha's sister and has her anointing Jesus' feet (12.3). Another difference is that the complaint about the waste of ointment, whose burden is exactly the same as that in Mark, is attributed by John to Judas Iscariot (vv. 4-5). He then takes the opportunity to vilify the betrayer in preparation for the Satanic possession of Judas which takes place at the final supper (v. 6, cf. 13.2, 27).[127] This interest in character assassination places John's account temporarily at a remove from Mark's and it means that neither of the anger references which frame the complaint in Mark's story is taken up here. However, this departure is short-lived as John's account immediately 'rejoins' Mark's version with Jesus' answer to the complaint in vv. 7-8 (cf. Mk 14.6-8).

I come now to focus on the Lazarus story itself and, on the basis of this evidence together with the findings in this study so far, to attempt an explanation of John's use of ἐμβριμᾶσθαι in that context. By the time John came to compose the Lazarus episode, he could evidently rely on his readers' knowledge of a version of the anointing story which was substantially the same as the account which now appears in chapter 12. This much is clear from the detailed reference he gives in 11.2. This functions not only to encourage his readers to associate the two stories but also to ensure that Mary's role as anointer is established in their minds at the outset of this new narrative. Once this point is made, however, and the sisters have acted jointly in v. 3, John deliberately gives prominence to Martha in anticipation of her forthcoming interview with Jesus (v. 5, cf. 20-27), keeping Mary in reserve for a later, and quite different, encounter. The occasion of their meeting is described in vv. 32-33.

On seeing Jesus, Mary throws herself at his feet (αὐτοῦ πρὸς τοὺς πόδας) which, as John's readers know, is precisely where she was when she anointed them (cf. τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ in 11.2 and the double reference in 12.3). The general scene is one of mourning and grief[128] and, with the intuitive woman who anointed Jesus for burial

126. See further, Sproston, ' "The Scripture" ', pp. 28-29.

127. Note the references to δεῖπνον in 12.2 and 13.2, 4 and the further reference to the money-box and the poor in 13.29. Note also the reference to Judas in Mk 14.10 as part of the anointing 'sandwich'. See also Sabbe, 'Anointing', pp. 2064 and 2075.

128. Is the image of Mary weeping in 11.33 a detail from the Lukan anointing

now at her familiar station, John pictures Jesus face to face with the prospect of his own death and has him respond appropriately. The Gethsemane tradition is already represented in John's text at 12.27 (cf. Mt. 26.38-39; Mk 14.34-36) and he intends another reference here with full emotional force. In order to convey adequately the violent intensity of Jesus' feelings (cf. Mt. 26.37; Mk 14.33), he picks up on the word which Mark had used to express the vehemence of the crowd towards the anointer (Mk 14.5), but which has remained unrepresented in his own account of the event, and he applies that term to Jesus' own response to her (ἐνεβριμήσατο). With the addition of his own phrase τῷ πνεύματι and also, perhaps, with more than a glance at Mark's first reference to the crowd as angered within (πρὸς ἑαυτούς),[129] he then turns the emotion inwards.[130] Finally, using ταράσσειν, which already belongs with τῷ πνεύματι in a Passion context (13.21; cf. 12.27), he produces an equivalent phrase (ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτόν)[131] which is decisive for the interpretation of the whole as a powerful rendering of Jesus' own anguish of spirit at the thought of his impending death. When ἐμβριμᾶσθαι next appears in John's text at v. 38, the reference will add nothing to what has already been established at this stage. There, the force of the πάλιν is almost certainly resumptive and John's phrase ἐμβριμώμενος ἐν ἑαυτῷ is simply a conflation of the two expressions in the present verse[132] and a further indication that he intends them to be taken synonymously.

The remainder of the pericope continues the Passion theme. In v. 34, Jesus asks where Lazarus is buried but the form of his question, ποῦ τεθείκατε αὐτόν; is clearly designed to connect with the later scene of the placing of Jesus' own body in the tomb (19.41-42) and especially with Mary Magdalene's expressions of anxiety over the whereabouts of his corpse in the following episode (20.2, 13, cf. v. 15: ποῦ ἔθηκας αὐτόν).[133] In v. 35 we learn that Jesus himself sheds tears (ἐδάκρυσεν).

tradition which John had not yet taken up into his text (cf. Lk. 7.38; Jn 12.3)?

129. Compare also Mark's description of Jesus himself as ἀναστενάξας τῷ πνεύματι in 8.12.

130. For this point, see Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, II, p. 335.

131. Note that this is the only occasion in the Gospel where ταράσσειν used of a person appears in the active form (see Fortna, *Gospel of Signs*, p. 82). This further underlines the view that John was intent on equivalence.

132. For these points, see Barrett, *Gospel*, p. 401; Lindars, 'Rebuking', p. 196.

133. On this use of τιθέναι, see esp. Barrett, *Gospel*, p. 400.

This description not only clarifies beyond doubt that Jesus' mood is one of grief but it also serves to trigger the divided response from 'the Jews' in the next two verses.[134] Nevertheless, the very similar reference in Heb. 5.7 to Jesus praying with loud cries and tears (δακρύων) suggests that John also intends this as yet another pointer to Gethsemane.[135] As the crowd of onlookers now divides in classical Johannine style,[136] these Passion references culminate in the exclamation by one party of 'Jews', ἴδε πῶς ἐφίλει αὐτόν (v. 36). As usual, 'the Jews' are made to say more than they mean. Jesus' response is not simply evidence of the bonds of human friendship. As the Johannine reader knows, Jesus loved his φίλοι by sacrificing his life for them (cf. 15.13).[137] The irony continues in the following verse as the opposing group questions why the one who cured the blind man could not also have wrought something spectacular to save this situation. This, of course, is precisely what Jesus will now do.[138] Note also how the reference by 'the Jews' to the earlier sign, which is consistent with their interest in the previous chapter (cf. 10.21), functions to link the two miracle stories explicitly. This connection, which has already been suggested in v. 22,[139] prepares the reader for the fact that Jesus will pray before the miracle (cf. 9.31).

Life Gained (11.38-44)

From the outset of this story, John has deliberately sought to present Jesus' fate as inextricably bound up with the fortunes of Lazarus his φίλος. Now, with Jesus finally at Lazarus's tomb, the destinies of the two characters will become fused in the act of resurrection. This will be achieved by a careful correlation of detail from the eschatological scenario in chapter 5 and from the narrative of Jesus' empty tomb in chapter 20. Before he describes that dramatic moment, however, John has some reminding to do.

By v. 38, a certain amount of water has passed under the Bethany bridge since Jesus and Martha last met. In the meanwhile, there has

134. So Barrett, *Gospel*, p. 400; Fortna, *Predecessor*, p. 102.

135. This link is made by Lindars (*Gospel*, p. 399).

136. For division among 'Jews' and others in the Gospel, see 7.12, 40-43; 9.16; 10.19-21; 11.45-46.

137. See above, Chapter 2.

138. For this point, see Lindars, *Behind the Fourth Gospel*, p. 57.

139. See above, Chapter 4.

been Jesus' emotional encounter with Mary which John, for his own purposes, has described at some length. Now, however, the point has come for Jesus to return Lazarus to life. The miracle will become a σημεῖον of the assurance of resurrection to eternal life at the last day for those who believe in Jesus, and John does not intend that message to be lost on his audience. Accordingly, as he now puts in place the final detail for the miracle, he also includes reminders of the earlier teaching pericope. This undertaking has the added advantage of delaying the miracle itself until the very last moment, an effect which John's natural instinct for drama will not have failed to register.

Resuming his story-line from v. 33, John brings Jesus to the tomb which he then describes as a cave sealed with a stone (v. 38). It is unclear from the Greek at this point whether he envisaged that the shaft of the tomb was vertical or horizontal. This is because ἐπί here, which describes the stone in relation to the tomb, can mean either 'upon' or 'against'.[140] However, given that John intends Lazarus to emerge unaided and shackled in bandages from such a place, the horizontal option at least seems sensible. More significantly, perhaps, this reading would bring John's description into line with the Gospel tradition on Jesus' empty tomb. As his story in chapter 20 attests, John was well aware of that tradition. In fact, he was so familiar with it that he was quite capable of casually referring to the stone's removal from Jesus' tomb without even having indicated its presence there in the first place (20.1). Thus, it is by no means impossible that his description of Lazarus's tomb in 11.38 was a known item from the same tradition. In that regard, it can scarcely be ignored that John's cave with a stone lying ἐπ' αὐτῷ is an excellent parallel to Mark's report of Jesus' burial-place as a tomb hewn out of a rock which had a stone rolled against its entrance (ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν) (Mk 15.46).[141]

In v. 39, Jesus orders the stone to be removed from the tomb, at which point Martha is reintroduced into the narrative, cumbersomely labelled for recognition purposes,[142] and made to quail at the prospect

140. See Barrett, *Gospel*, p. 401; Lindars, *Gospel*, p. 399.

141. See also Mt. 27.60, where a horizontal tomb is clearly envisaged. Both Brown (*Gospel*, I, p. 426) and Barrett (*Gospel*, p. 401) favour the horizontal option in the case of Lazarus.

142. Schnackenburg (*Gospel*, II, p. 517 n. 64) and Barrett (*Gospel*, p. 401) suspect a later gloss at this point. Nevertheless, this reference is more than likely to be another example of John's 'belt and braces' approach to reminding his readers

of the stench of her brother's corpse after four days. This enables John to remind his readers of the circumstances of Martha's earlier meeting with Jesus and to impress the point again that Lazarus is truly dead (cf. v. 17). Martha's horrified response at this stage is in no way inconsistent with her presentation as the model of Johannine faith in the earlier episode. While Jesus' assurance that her brother would rise again (v. 23) could have been taken to mean that Lazarus would be returned to life, this was not the turn the conversation took at that point. At v. 27, Martha gave her unqualified assent to the teaching that belief in Jesus means possession of eternal life in the present which guarantees resurrection to life at the last day. There has been nothing to prepare her for the fact that her brother will rise *now*.[143] Jesus' reply to Martha in v. 40 deliberately recalls his earlier instruction to her (οὐκ εἶπόν σοι...; 'Did I not tell you...?') while at the same time expressing the import of his words in terms of seeing the δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ ('glory of God').[144] The phrase returns us to the programmatic v. 4 where Jesus had pronounced that Lazarus's illness was ὑπὲρ τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ. Thus, the glory to be seen by the faithful in this final sign (cf. 2.11) is now defined as Jesus' God-given power to raise the dead and give life (vv. 25-26, cf. 5.21).

In v. 41, John takes up his story-line once more with the information that the stone was removed from Lazarus's tomb (ἦραν οὖν τὸν λίθον). The language here, which repeats that of Jesus' order in v. 39, is again reminiscent of the narrative in chapter 20. In fact, John's readers can scarcely have failed to make the connection with the scene which greeted Mary Magdalene on her arrival at Jesus' own tomb (τὸν λίθον ἠρμένον ἐκ τοῦ μνημείου) (20.1).[145]

With the stage set for the miracle to happen, John has Jesus pause for prayer (vv. 41b-42). This is not unexpected in view of his recent reference to the previous sign (v. 37), which already contains a hint that Jesus had prayed successfully before the cure (9.31). However, as I have argued, the form the prayer takes is the direct outcome of John's

(see above, n. 56). The words 'sister of the dead man' are perhaps intended to recall Martha's opening gambit (v. 21) in which she refers to her brother having died.

143. For this point, see esp. Wilcox, ' "Prayer" ', p. 129.

144. So Brown, *Gospel*, I, pp. 427, 436; Lindars, *Gospel*, p. 400; Lee, *Symbolic Narratives*, p. 196.

145. Only John uses the verb αἴρειν of the removal of the stone sealing Jesus' tomb (see Barrett, *Gospel*, p. 401).

application to Jesus of the 'ask, and it will be given' logion on Martha's lips in v. 22.[146] Thus, we see Jesus giving thanks for the miracle already granted, adding parenthetically that such an immediate affirming response from God is guaranteed for his petition at all times. By this means, John seeks to assure his beleaguered flock of the power of Christian prayer.

As noted earlier, the opening words of the prayer are a quotation from Ps. 118.21. If, as I have suggested, Martha's ὁ ... ἐρχόμενος in v. 27 was also drawn from this psalm in deference to the tradition in 12.13, then perhaps a further reference here, as the earlier pericope is recalled, is not too surprising. Max Wilcox makes the perceptive suggestion that the occurrence of v. 21 of the psalm at this point was triggered by the mention of the word 'stone'.[147] Wilcox proposes, first, that the reference to Ps. 118.21 in the prayer should be taken as part of a wider context, including at least the famous 'stone' text next to it (v. 22) and, second, that the mention of 'stone' in the story itself has somehow acted as a keyword which has linked narrative and psalm together at some unspecified pre-Johannine stage. My only objection to this is that I see no reason to relegate all this interesting editorial activity to the pre-Johannine level. Why cannot the word 'stone' have acted as a keyword for John himself? If so, then the following scenario presents itself. As he turns to compose the prayer, perhaps with Psalm 118 already in his head from Martha's earlier words, his reference to the removal of the stone (v. 41a) puts him in mind of the rejection of the stone in the psalm, from which point it is but a short step to finding the words of the neighbouring verse conveniently to hand for Jesus' opening words.[148] In this connection, it is well worth observing how neatly John has actually contrived to link the stone reference with the prayer at the text level in v. 41. Notice the nice little pun where

146. See above, Chapter 4. For the argument that 9.31 is also a version of the logion, see Hoskyns, *Gospel*, p. 406.

147. See Wilcox, '"Prayer"', pp. 131-32.

148. Another possibility is that the psalm reference, like the stone, had its origin in the resurrection tradition which John records at chapter 20. Note that Ps. 118.22 is a vindication text which is applied to the resurrection by other New Testament writers. See Acts. 4.11; 1 Pet. 2.7 cf. vv. 4-5. On this application in Mark (12.10-11; cf. Mt. 21.42; Lk. 20.17), see esp. Marcus, *The Way of the Lord*, pp. 114-15. Note also John's own reference to 'the scripture', tantalizingly unspecified, in 20.9.

'lifting the stone' moves on to 'lifting the eyes' in a prayerful gesture (cf. 17.1) and so, finally, on to the prayer itself.

Hardly surprisingly, in view of John's general intentions at this point, the prayer itself is now the occasion for a call to faith (v. 42b). Jesus declares that he has spoken for the sake of the bystanders (διὰ τὸν ὄχλον τὸν περιεστῶτα εἶπον) so that they may believe that he was sent by the Father. Note the link with 12.28-30 where the voice from heaven, which follows Jesus' prayer, is not for Jesus but for the bystanders (ὁ ... ὄχλος ὁ ἑστώς, 12.29).[149] Although the mention of the crowd could indicate that John is targeting 'the Jews' at this point, especially in the light of their response in v. 45, this is probably not the case. Both the injunction to believe, which we have seen directed only at the faithful in this story (vv. 15, 26, 40), and the Johannine ring of σύ με ἀπέστειλας suggest rather an appeal to those firmly within the fold. As I have already proposed, the reference to Jesus as sent by God, which is the essence of Johannine Christology, is probably an indicator that John's mind is already running along the lines of his earlier argument at 5.19-29.[150]

Like the fine dramatist he is, John has kept the real fireworks until last (vv. 43-44). Up to now, Jesus' path towards the miracle has been strewn with delays, doubts and red herrings.[151] However, the climax when it comes does not disappoint us, and the extraordinary image of Lazarus emerging from the tomb still arrayed in the trappings of death is a literary masterstroke.

Turning from his prayer, Jesus now commands Lazarus to come out of the tomb (v. 43). As I argued earlier, the scene is deliberately constructed to suggest John's depiction of the eschaton in 5.25, 28-29.[152] Thus, Jesus' loud cry anticipates the mighty voice of the Son of man raising the dead at the last day, while Lazarus, here called by name

149. See Wilcox, ' "Prayer" ', p. 130 with n. 2.

150. See above, Chapter 3. The reference to Jesus as 'sent' in 5.24 reaffirms a key concept in the argument of 3.16-21. See esp. 3.16-17, where the parallel in 1 Jn 4.9-10 confirms that the material belongs to the 'Johannine kerygma' (see above Chapter 1).

151. On these tactics, see esp. Lindars, *Behind the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 56-58.

152. See above, Chapter 3. Fortna retains virtually the whole of vv. 43-44 for the pre-Johannine miracle source. He accomplishes this without the slightest reference to 5.25-29. (see *Gospel of Signs*, pp. 83-84, 86; *idem*, *Predecessor*, pp. 95-96, 103). The same exercise is performed by Wilkens ('Erweckung', p. 27), Bultmann (*Gospel*, p. 409 n. 4), Schnackenburg (*Gospel*, II, p. 320) and Wagner (*Auferstehung*, p. 342).

(cf. 10.3),[153] represents the true believer whose reward is the resurrection of life.

In v. 44, Lazarus emerges from the tomb alive but still bound by his graveclothes.[154] Jesus then orders him to be released and John's story closes. The detail of the burial garments here is undoubtedly designed to link Lazarus's resurrection with that of Jesus himself. Thus, the κειρίαι which bind Lazarus hand and foot are clearly the equivalent of the linen strips (ὀθόνια) later found in Jesus' tomb[155] and the σουδάριον for the head is specified in both cases (cf. 20.5-7). By this means, as with the earlier references to the tomb and the removal of the stone (vv. 38, 41), the raising of Lazarus is patterned after Jesus' own resurrection, the event on which the Christian hope of the future life is founded (14.19; cf. 1 Cor. 15.12-19). Thus, while it is true to say that the Lazarus miracle is, as Lindars puts it, 'a sort of dress rehearsal for the Resurrection of Jesus'[156] because its present position in the Gospel produces that effect, nevertheless, what John is actually implying here is rather more complex. To extend Lindars's expression, the miracle is a dress rehearsal for the resurrection of the faithful dead by the risen Jesus as Lord of life.

We must also note, however, that in one very striking respect, Lazarus's resurrection is not at all like that of Jesus. In complete contrast with the later evidence in Jesus' empty tomb, Lazarus is powerless to remove his own graveclothes. Indeed, John seems to want to emphasize this difference. Thus, instead of the scene of calm deliberation in 20.5-7 with the sheets lying in the tomb and the napkin carefully folded, the impression here is laboured: Lazarus comes forth still fettered by his bandages (δεδεμένος τοὺς πόδας καὶ τὰς χεῖρας κειρίαις) and with the napkin, which in Jesus' case had rested on his head (20.7), wound suffocatingly round his face (ἡ ὄψις αὐτοῦ

153. This comparison is drawn by Barrett (*Gospel*, p. 403) and Kremer (*Lazarus*, p. 78).

154. Quite how Lazarus achieved mobility under these conditions is unlikely to have troubled John's thoughts. Further appeal to the miraculous is unnecessary, *pace* Bultmann, *Gospel*, p. 409; Fortna, *Gospel of Signs*, p. 84; *idem*, *Predecessor*, p. 96. On this, see Lindars, *Gospel*, p. 402; Beasley-Murray, *John*, p. 195.

155. John's choice of ὀθόνιον in 19.40; 20.5-7 is almost certainly dictated by his use of 'Lukan' source material at that point, see Lindars, *Gospel*, pp. 596-97; Neirynck, 'John and the Synoptics' (1982), p. 393 n. 114.

156. Lindars, *Gospel*, p. 382.

σουδαρίῳ περιεδέδετο). This detail suggests that in some sense Lazarus is not yet freed from the power of death.[157] W.E. Reiser maintains that Lazarus's return to life is presented in this way because he did not rise to glory as Jesus did. Thus, in his case the graveclothes remain as a sign that death will eventually claim him again.[158] While it is true that the nature of the miracle is such that Lazarus will indeed die again sooner or later (cf. 12.10), Reiser's proposal quite mistakes what John is about here. In fact, this explanation completely ignores the miracle's function as a sign and fails to address the implication of the final moment when Jesus commands that Lazarus be released. This brings us to the point. This distinction exists because, when it comes to the matter of resurrection, Lazarus is not Jesus and John does not confuse the two. According to John's Gospel, Jesus has the power to raise himself. There is evidence enough of this in the event in chapter 20 but, in fact, this much is actually declared by Jesus on more than one occasion. For example, in 2.19 Jesus refers to the raising of the temple of his body as something he personally will accomplish (ἐγερῶ αὐτόν). Even more telling is his description of the charge he has received from the Father in the chapter immediately preceding the Lazarus account (10.17-18). There he claims that he has the power not only to lay down his life but also to take it again (ἐξουσίαν ἔχω πάλιν λαβεῖν αὐτήν, v. 18). In other words, when John describes the raising of Lazarus, he is working by contrast with Jesus: Lazarus is passive throughout. Thus, the stone is indeed removed from Lazarus's tomb but only at Jesus' command; Lazarus does indeed rise but only at Jesus' call; and Lazarus is finally liberated from the bonds of death but only at Jesus' word.[159]

157. So Kremer, *Lazarus*, p. 79. On the negative connotations of δέω in John's Gospel, see D. Sylva, 'Nicodemus and his Spices (John 19.39)', *NTS* 34 (1988), pp. 148-51. See esp. Sylva's comment on Jesus' burial in 19.40 and on Lazarus: 'In each case the binding represents an action which is contrary to Jesus' function as the resurrection and the life' (p. 149).

158. W.E. Reiser, 'The Case of the Tidy Tomb: The Place of the Napkins of John 11.44 and 20.7', *HeyJ* 14 (1973), pp. 47-57 (54, 55). Reiser's thesis is endorsed, with reference to Jewish exegesis of Isa. 25.7-8, in B. Osborne's note, 'A Folded Napkin in an Empty Tomb: John 11.44 and 20.7 Again', *HeyJ* 14 (1973), pp. 437-40 (440). See also Lee, *Symbolic Narratives*, pp. 215-16.

159. See esp. Culpepper's comment on the contrast: 'Lazarus...represents the disciple to whom life has been given and challenges the reader to accept the realization of eschatological expectations in Jesus' (*Anatomy*, p. 141). Has a further

In fact, this differentiation between Jesus and the faithful believer could not be more clear in Jesus' earlier words to the disciples in v. 11. His announcement that Lazarus, the φίλος of the whole company, is asleep is an invitation to the faithful to lay down their lives in imitation of Jesus. However, his next words, ἀλλὰ πορεύομαι ἵνα ἐξυπνίσω αὐτόν, establish beyond doubt that the similarity ends there. The disciples may well enter into Lazarus's slumber, as Jesus himself will do, but they can wake neither themselves nor Lazarus; only Jesus can do that.

contrast with the fragrance of Jesus' burial ointment in 12.3 suggested to John the form of Martha's objection in 11.39? Certainly ὄζειν and ὀσμή are not otherwise used.

CONCLUSION

And so, have I finally come to terms with the making of the Lazarus story? Well, of course not. This magnificent composition finds the evangelist at the height of his powers. Here for the first time sign and discourse have been fused to form a narrative of unprecedented richness and complexity which, with the added genius of John's dramatic sensibilities and sure literary touch, is a masterpiece of the Gospel writer's art.[1] It cannot be thought that I will have successfully unravelled the intricacies of such a piece or have adequately gained the measure of the mind which created it. Fortunately, however, that was not the claim that my analysis of the story was designed to test. Instead, it was proposed that the addition of 1 John as a control to isolate tradition in the evangelist's text would bring us closer than otherwise would be possible to understanding how John worked to produce his Gospel. I now dare to hope that this has been achieved in the case of the Lazarus story. If so, then the epistle as a control has proved its worth and the way lies open to exploit the potential of its tradition links with the Gospel to the full. With this in mind, I will conclude this study with a brief scattering of ideas and suggestions generated by this new approach which may prove of interest and point the way towards future research.

1. For the author of 1 John, the phrase ὁ λόγος τῆς ζωῆς (1.1) refers to the Gospel message which originated with Jesus. The evangelist's presentation of Jesus delivering the life-giving λόγος during his ministry is consistent with this (cf. 5.24; 8.51, 52). In the Gospel prologue, however, which is massively

1. According to Burkett, the hypothesis that makes a single author responsible for the Lazarus story must envisage 'an author who was either senile, incompetent, or unable to finish the work' ('Two Accounts', p. 230). I trust that no such impression of John has been conveyed by my analysis. It is perhaps ironic that Burkett's own analysis, in which he conjectures that two separate accounts have been edited together to make one, reduces the evangelist's competence to skill with scissors and paste.

indebted to the Wisdom traditions, we see a departure from this in that Jesus himself is the human embodiment of the λόγος (1.14). Could it be that, in presenting Jesus as the personification of Wisdom, John has preferred the term λόγος from his own community's tradition, thus taking the original step of identifying Jesus *as* the Gospel?

2. Comparison of Jn 3.16, 18 with 1 Jn 4.9 establishes that μονογενής belongs with υἱός in the so-called Johannine kerygma. This being the case, the likelihood is that when John introduces μονογενής into his prologue (Jn 1.14, 18), he is working from this 'creed' and expects the term υἱός to be understood there. This may shed some light on the interpretation of the expressions ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός and μονογενὴς θεός in those verses.
3. In John and 1 John, Jesus takes away the sin(s) of the world (Jn 1.29; 1 Jn 3.5; cf. 2.2). Only the evangelist, however, prefaces this tradition with the title 'Lamb of God'. This suggests that in his text the title (whatever its origins) functions in relation to the tradition as a gloss. As such, it can be repeated and relied upon to bring the tradition to mind (Jn 1.36).
4. The epistle writer's first announcement from the tradition ἀπ' ἀρχῆς is that God is light (1 Jn 1.5). According to the tradition shared with 1 John Jesus is God's Son sent into the world (Jn 3.17; 1 Jn 4.9-10). Has the evangelist worked with these concepts to produce his descriptions of Jesus as light come into the world and as the world's light (1.4-5, 9; 3.19; 8.12; 9.5; 11.9-10; 12.35-36, 46)?
5. The author of 1 John describes Jesus as ὁ παράκλητος (2.1) and the same is implied by Jesus in the Gospel with the expression ἄλλος παράκλητος (Jn 14.16). Only the evangelist, however, attaches the term also to the Holy Spirit (14.16-17, 26; 15.26; 16.7). In describing the Spirit as Jesus' replacement on earth, has John, as part of his policy to equate the two figures, deliberately transferred to the Spirit a description which applied to Jesus in the tradition?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alexander, N., *The Epistles of John* (Torch Bible Commentaries; London: SCM Press, 1962).

Ashton, J., 'The Identity and Function of the Ἰουδαῖοι in the Fourth Gospel', *NovT* 27 (1985), pp. 40-75; reprinted as 'The Jews in John', in *idem*, *Studying John*, pp. 36-70.

—*Understanding the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991).

—*Studying John: Approaches to the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994).

Bailey, J.L., and Vander Broek, L.D., *Literary Forms in the New Testament* (London: SPCK, 1992).

Barrett, C.K., *The Gospel According to St John* (London: SPCK, 2nd edn, 1978).

—'Christocentric or Theocentric? Observations on the Theological Method of the Fourth Gospel', in *idem*, *Essays on John* (London: SPCK, 1982), pp. 1-18.

Bartholomew, G.L., 'Feed my Lambs: John 21.15-19 as Oral Gospel', *Semeia* 39 (1987), pp. 69-96.

Bassler, J.M., 'Mixed Signals: Nicodemus in the Fourth Gospel', *JBL* 108 (1989), pp. 635-46.

Beare, F.W., *The Gospel According to Matthew: A Commentary* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1981).

Beasley-Murray, G.R., *John* (WBC, 36; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987).

Belle, G. van, *Les parenthèses dans l'évangile de Jean: Aperçu historique et classification, texte grec de Jean* (SNTA, 11; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1985).

—*The Signs Source in the Fourth Gospel: Historical Survey and Critical Evaluation of the Semeia Hypothesis* (BETL, 116; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1994).

Bernard, J.H., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John* (2 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1928).

Best, E., *Following Jesus: Discipleship in the Gospel of Mark* (JSNTSup, 4; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981).

Beutler, J., 'Two Ways of Gathering: The Plot to Kill Jesus in John 11.47-53', *NTS* 40 (1994), pp. 399-406.

Black, M., *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 3rd edn, 1967).

Boer, M.C., de 'Narrative Criticism, Historical Criticism, and the Gospel of John', *JSNT* 47 (1992), pp. 35-48; reprinted in Porter and Evans (eds.), *The Johannine Writings*, pp. 95-108.

Boismard, M.-E., 'Un procédé rédactionnel dans le quatrième évangile: La Wiederaufnahme', in de Jonge (ed.), *L'évangile de Jean*, pp. 235-41.

Bonnard, P., 'La première épître de Jean: Est-elle Johannique?', in de Jonge (ed.), *L'évangile de Jean*, pp. 301-305.

Borgen, P., 'God's Agent in the Fourth Gospel', in J. Neusner (ed.), *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough* (SHR, 14; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1968), pp. 137-48.

—'The Use of Tradition in John 12.44-50', *NTS* 26 (1979–80), pp. 18-35.

—'John and the Synoptics: Can Paul Offer Help?', in G.F. Hawthorne and O. Betz (eds.), *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament: Essays in Honor of E. Earle Ellis for his 60th Birthday* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), pp. 80-94.

Brooke, A.E., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Johannine Epistles* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1957).

Brooke, G.J., review of *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future* by E. Prech, in L.L. Grabbe (ed.), *The Society for Old Testament Study Book List 1994* (Leeds: Maney, 1994), p. 114.

Brown, R.E., *The Gospel According to John* (2 vols.; AB, 29, 29A; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966; London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1971).

—*The Community of the Beloved Disciple* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1979).

—*The Epistles of John* (AB, 30; London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1983).

Bruce, F.F., *The Epistles of John* (London: Pickering & Inglis, 1970).

Bultmann, R., *Das Evangelium des Johannes* (Meyers Kommentar, 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962).

—'The Eschatology of the Gospel of John', in *idem, Faith and Understanding*, I (ed. R.W. Funk; trans. L.P. Smith; London: SCM Press, 1969), pp. 165-83.

—*The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (trans. G.R. Beasley-Murray; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971).

—*The Johannine Epistles* (trans. R.P. O'Hara, L.C. McGaughy and R.W. Funk; Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1973).

Burkett, D., 'Two Accounts of Lazarus' Resurrection in John 11', *NovT* 36 (1994), pp. 209-232

Carrez, M., 'Le "Nous" en 2 Corinthiens', *NTS* 26 (1980), pp. 474-86.

Carson, D.A., *The Gospel According to John* (Leicester: IVP; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991).

Casey, P.M., *From Jewish Prophet to Gentile God: The Origins and Development of New Testament Christology* (Cambridge: James Clark; Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991).

Chapman, J., 'We Know that his Testimony is True', *JTS* 31 (1930), pp. 379-87.

Chilton, B., 'A Comparative Study of Synoptic Development: The Dispute between Cain and Abel in the Palestinian Targums and the Beelzebul Controversy in the Gospels', *JBL* 101 (1982), pp. 553-62.

Cosgrove, C.H., 'The Place where Jesus is: Allusions to Baptism and the Eucharist in the Fourth Gospel', *NTS* 35 (1989), pp. 522-39.

Crossan, J.D., *Sayings Parallels: A Workbook for the Jesus Tradition* (Foundations and Facets; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986).

Culpepper, R.A., *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* (Foundations and Facets; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983).

Davey, J.E., *The Jesus of St. John: Historical and Christological Studies in the Fourth Gospel* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1958).

Davies, M., *Rhetoric and Reference in the Fourth Gospel* (JSNTSup, 69; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992).

Davies, W.D., and Allison, D.C., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew* (3 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988–97).

Dodd, C.H., *The Johannine Epistles* (MNTC; London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1946).

—*The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953).

—*Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963).

Edwards, R.B., 'The Christological Basis of the Johannine Footwashing', in J.B. Green and M. Turner (eds.), *Jesus of Nazareth: Lord and Christ. Essays on the Historical Jesus and New Testament Christology* (Festschrift I. Howard Marshall Festschrift; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1994), pp. 367-83.

—'Innovative Work on John', *ExpTim* 106 (1995), pp. 245-46.

—*The Johannine Epistles* (NTG; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996).

Elliott, J.K., 'Is ὁ ἐξελθών a Title for Jesus in Mark i.45?', *JTS* NS 27 (1976), pp. 402-405.

Ellis, P.F., *The Genius of John* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1984).

Evans, E., 'The Verb ἀγαπᾶν in the Fourth Gospel', in F.L. Cross (ed.), *Studies in the Fourth Gospel* (London: Mowbray, 1957), pp. 64-71.

Fitzmyer, J.A., *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (London: Chapman, 1971).

Fortna, R.T., *The Gospel of Signs: A Reconstruction of the Narrative Source underlying the Fourth Gospel* (SNTSMS, 11; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970).

—*The Fourth Gospel and its Predecessor: From Narrative Source to Present Gospel* (Studies of the New Testament and its World; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1989).

Freyne, S., 'Vilifying the Other and Defining the Self: Matthew's and John's Anti-Jewish Polemic in Focus', in J. Neusner and E.S. Frerichs (eds.), *'To See Ourselves as Others See Us': Christians, Jews, 'Others' in Late Antiquity* (Chico, CA; Scholars Press, 1985), pp. 117-43.

Fuller, R.H., *Interpreting the Miracles* (London: SCM Press, 1963).

García Martínez, F., *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran* (STDJ, 9; Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1992).

Gaventa, B.R., 'The Archive of Excess: John 21 and the Problem of Narrative Closure', in R.A. Culpepper and C.C. Black (eds.), *Exploring the Gospel of John* (Festschrift for D. Moody Smith; Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1996), pp. 240-52.

Giblin, C.H., 'Suggestion, Negative Reponse, and Positive Action in St John's Portrayal of Jesus (John 2.1-11; 4.46-54; 7.2-14; 11.1-44)', *NTS* 26 (1980), pp. 197-211.

Goldsmith, D., ' "*Ask, and it will be Given* ...": Toward Writing the History of a Logion', *NTS* 35 (1989), pp. 254-65.

Goulder, M.D., *Luke: A New Paradigm* (2 vols.; JSNTSup, 20; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989).

—'Nicodemus', *SJT* 44 (1991), pp. 153-68.

—'John 1,1–2,12 and the Synoptics', in A. Denaux (ed.), *John and the Synoptics* (BETL, 101; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), pp. 201-237.

Grayston, K., *The Johannine Epistles* (NCB; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1984).

—*The Gospel of John* (Epworth Commentaries; London: Epworth Press, 1990).

Guilding, A., *The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship: A Study of the Relation of St. John's Gospel to the Ancient Jewish Lectionary System* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960).

Gundry, R.H., *Mark: A Commentary on his Apology for the Cross* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993).

Günther, W., 'Love', *NIDNTT*, II, p. 548.

Haenchen, E., *A Commentary on the Gospel of John* (2 vols.; trans. R.W. Funk; Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984).

Hanson, A.T., 'The Old Testament Background to the Raising of Lazarus', in E.A. Livingstone (ed.), *Studia Evangelica*, VI (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, 112; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1973), pp. 252-55.

—*The New Testament Interpretation of Scripture* (London: SPCK, 1980).

—*The Prophetic Gospel: A Study of John and the Old Testament* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1991).

Hartin, P.J., *James and the Q Sayings of Jesus* (JSNTSup, 47; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991).

Hayman, P., 'Monotheism—A Misused Word in Jewish Studies?', *JJS* 42 (1991), pp. 1-15.

Hengel, M., *The Johannine Question* (London: SCM Press; Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1989).

Holtzmann, H.J., *Evangelium, Briefe und Offenbarung des Johannes* (Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament, 4; Freiburg: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1891).

Horbury, W., 'The Benediction of the *Minim* and Early Jewish-Christian Controversy', *JTS* NS 33 (1982), pp. 19-61.

Horsley, G.H.R., *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity* (5 vols.; Macquarie University: Ancient History Documentary Research Centre, 1981–83, 1987, 1989).

Hoskyns, E.C., *The Fourth Gospel* (ed. F.N. Davey; London: Faber & Faber, 2nd edn, 1947).

Houlden, J.L., *A Commentary on the Johannine Epistles* (BNTC; London: A. & C. Black, rev. edn, 1994).

Howard, W.F., *The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation* (London: Epworth Press, 2nd edn, 1935).

Jeremias, J., *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (trans. A. Ehrhardt; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955).

Jonge, M. de, *Jesus: Stranger from Heaven and Son of God. Jesus Christ and the Christians in Johannine Perspective* (SBLSBS, 11; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977).

Jonge, M. de, *et al.* (eds.), *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text* (PVTG, 1; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1978).

Kermode, F., 'John', in R. Alter and F. Kermode (eds.), *The Literary Guide to the Bible* (London: Fontana Press, 1987), pp. 440-66.

Kimelman, R., '*Birkat Ha-Minim* and the Lack of Evidence for an Anti-Christian Jewish Prayer in Late Antiquity', in E.P. Sanders, A.I. Baumgarten and A. Mendelson (eds.), *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition* (3 vols.; London: SCM Press, 1980–82), II, pp. 226-44.

Kittel, G., 'ἀκούω', *TDNT*, I, pp. 216-25.

Kitzberger, I.R., 'Mary of Bethany and Mary of Magdala—Two Female Characters in the Johannine Passion Narrative: A Feminist, Narrative-Critical Reader-Response', *NTS* 41 (1995), pp. 564-86.

Kremer, J., *Lazarus: Die Geschichte einer Auferstehung. Text, Wirkungsgeschichte und Botschaft von Joh 11, 1-46* (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1985).

Künzi, M., *Das Naherwartungslogion Markus 9, 1 par: Geschichte seiner Auslegung*

(Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Exegese, 21; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1977).

Kysar, R., *The Fourth Evangelist and his Gospel: An Examination of Contemporary Scholarship* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1975).

—*John: The Maverick Gospel* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, rev. edn, 1993).

Lagrange, M.-J., *Evangile selon Saint Jean* (EBib; Paris: J. Gabalda, 5th edn, 1936).

Law, R., *The Tests of Life* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 3rd edn, 1979).

Lee, D.A., *The Symbolic Narratives of the Fourth Gospel: The Interplay of Form and Meaning* (JSNTSup, 95; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994).

Lieu, J.M., 'Authority to Become Children of God: A Study of 1 John', *NovT* 23 (1981), pp. 210-28.

—*The Second and Third Epistles of John: History and Background* (Studies of the New Testament and its World; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1986).

—*The Theology of the Johannine Epistles* (NTT; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

—'What Was from the Beginning: Scripture and Tradition in the Johannine Epistles', *NTS* 39 (1993), pp. 458-77.

Lightfoot, R.H., *St. John's Gospel: A Commentary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956).

Lindars, B., *Behind the Fourth Gospel* (SCC, 3; London: SPCK, 1971).

—*The Gospel of John* (NCB; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1972).

—'Mark 10.45: A Ransom for Many', *ExpTim* 93 (1981–82), pp. 292-95.

—*Jesus Son of Man* (London: SPCK, 1983).

—'The Sound of the Trumpet: Paul and Eschatology', *BJRL* 67 (1984–85), pp. 766-82.

—*John* (NTG; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990).

—review of *The Fourth Gospel and its Predecessor: From Narrative Source to Present Gospel*, by R.T. Fortna (Studies of the New Testament and its World; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1989), in *SJT* 43 (1990), pp. 526-27.

—'Capernaum Revisited: John 4,46-53 and the Synoptics', in C.M. Tuckett (ed.), *Essays on John by Barnabas Lindars* (SNTA, 17; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), pp. 199-214.

—'Δικαιοσύνη in Jn 16.8 and 10', in Tuckett (ed.), *Essays*, pp. 21-31.

—'Discourse and Tradition: The Use of the Sayings of Jesus in the Discourses of the Fourth Gospel', in Tuckett (ed.), *Essays*, pp. 113-29; also reprinted in Porter and Evans (eds.), *The Johannine Writings*, pp. 13-30.

—'The Persecution of Christians in Jn 15.18-16.4a', in Tuckett (ed.), *Essays*, pp. 131-52.

—'Rebuking the Spirit: A New Analysis of the Lazarus Story of John 11', in Tuckett (ed.), *Essays*, pp. 183-98.

—'The Son of Man in the Johannine Christology', in Tuckett (ed.), *Essays*, pp. 33-50.

—'The Son of Man in the Theology of John', in Tuckett (ed.), *Essays*, pp. 153-66.

—'Traditions behind the Fourth Gospel', in Tuckett (ed.), *Essays*, pp. 87-104.

Loader, W., *The Johannine Epistles* (Epworth Commentaries; London: Epworth Press, 1992).

Loisy, A., *Le quatrième évangile* (Paris: Alphonse Picard et Fils, 1903).

Longenecker, B.W., 'The Unbroken Messiah: A Johannine Feature and its Social Functions', *NTS* 41 (1995), pp. 428-41.

Louw, J.P., 'On Johannine Style', *Neot* 20 (1986), pp. 5-12.

Malatesta, E., *Interiority and Covenant: A Study of* εἶναι ἐν *and* μένειν ἐν *in the First Letter of Saint John* (AnBib, 69; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978).

Mansoor, M. (trans.), *The Thanksgiving Hymns* (STDJ, 3; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1961).

Marcus, J., *The Way of the Lord: Christological Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992).

Marsh, J., *The Gospel of St John* (Pelican Gospel Commentaries; Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1968).

Marshall, I.H., *The Epistles of John* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978).

Martyn, J.L., 'Glimpses into the History of the Johannine Community', in *idem, The Gospel of John in Christian History: Essays for Interpreters* (Theological Inquiries; New York: Paulist Press, 1978), pp. 90-121.

—*History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2nd rev. edn, 1979).

Metzger, B.M., 'Names for the Nameless in the New Testament: A Study in the Growth of Christian Tradition', in *idem, New Testament Studies: Philological, Versional, and Patristic* (NTTS, 10; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1980), pp. 23-43.

—*A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2nd edn, 1994).

Minear, P.S., 'The Original Functions of John 21', *JBL* 102 (1983), pp. 85-98.

Moloney, F.J., *The Johannine Son of Man* (Biblioteca di Scienze Religiose, 14; Rome: Libreria Ateneo Salesiano, 1976).

Moore, A.L., *The Parousia in the New Testament* (NovTSup, 13; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1966).

Moore, G.F., *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim* (3 vols.; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1927–30).

Morgenthaler, R., *Statistik des neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes* (Zürich: Gotthelf, 3rd edn, 1982).

Moule, C.F.D., 'The Meaning of "Life" in the Gospel and Epistles of St John: A Study in the Story of Lazarus, John 11.1-44', *Theology* 78 (1975), pp. 114-25.

Mourlon Beernaert, P., 'Parallelisme entre Jean 11 et 12: Etude de structure littéraire et théologique', in A.-L. Descamps *et al.*, *Genèse et structure d'un texte du Nouveau Testament: Etude interdisciplinaire du chapître 11 de l'évangile de Jean* (LD, 104; Paris: Cerf; Louvain-La-Neuve: Cabay, 1981), pp. 123-49.

Moyise, S., *The Old Testament in the Book of Revelation* (JSNTSup, 115; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995).

Muraoka, T., 'On the So-called *Dativus Ethicus* in Hebrew', *JTS* NS 29 (1978), pp. 495-98.

Nardoni, E., 'A Redactional Interpretation of Mark 9.1', *CBQ* 43 (1981), pp. 365-84.

Neirynck, F., 'L'epanalepsis et la critique littéraire: A propos de l'évangile de Jean', in F. van Segbroeck (ed.), *Evangelica: Gospel Studies—Etudes d'évangile: Collected Essays by Frans Neirynck* (BETL, 60; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1982), pp. 143-78.

—'John and the Synoptics', in de Jonge (ed.), *L'évangile de Jean*, pp. 73-106; now reprinted and extended in F. van Segbroeck (ed.), *Evangelica: Gospel Studies–Etudes d'évangile. Collected Essays by Frans Neirynck* (BETL, 60; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1982), pp. 365-400.

—'John and the Synoptics 1975–1990', in A. Denaux (ed.), *John and the Synoptics* (BETL, 101; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), pp. 3-62.

Nicol, W., *The Sēmeia in the Fourth Gospel: Tradition and Redaction* (NovTSup, 32; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1972).

Okure, T., *The Johannine Approach to Mission: A Contextual Study of John 4.1-42* (WUNT, 31; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1988).

Ong, W.J., *The Presence of the Word: Some Prolegomena for Cultural and Religious History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967).

—*Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word* (New Accents; London: Methuen, 1982).

—'Text as Interpretation: Mark and After', *Semeia* 39 (1987), pp. 7-26.

Osborne, B., 'A Folded Napkin in an Empty Tomb: John 11.44 and 20.7 Again', *HeyJ* 14 (1973), pp. 437-40.

Painter, J., 'The "Opponents" in 1 John', *NTS* 32 (1986), pp. 48-71.

Parker, P., 'Bethany beyond Jordan', *JBL* 74 (1955), pp. 257-61.

Perkins, P., *The Johannine Epistles* (New Testament Message, 21; Dublin: Veritas, 1979).

Piper, O.A., '1 John and the Didache of the Primitive Church', *JBL* 66 (1947), pp. 437-51.

Pollard, T.E., 'The Raising of Lazarus', in E.A. Livingstone (ed.), *Studia Evangelica*, VI (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, 112; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1973), pp. 434-43.

Ponthot, J., 'La methode historico-critique en exegese: Application à Jean 11', in A.-L. Descamps *et al.*, *Genèse et structure d'un texte du Nouvean Testament: Etude interdisciplinaire du chapitre 11 de l'évangile de Jean* (LD, 104; Paris: Cerf; Louvain-la-Neuve: Cabay, 1981), pp. 81-105.

Porter, S.E., and C.A. Evans (eds.), *The Johannine Writings: A Sheffield Reader* (BS, 32; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995).

Puech, E., 'Une apocalypse messianique (4Q521)', *RevQ* 15 (1991–92), pp. 475-519.

—*La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: Immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle? Histoire d'une croyance dans le Judaïsme Ancien* (EBib NS 21–22; 2 vols.; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1993).

Quast, K.B., *Peter and the Beloved Disciple: Figures for a Community in Crisis* (JSNTSup, 32; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989).

Reiser, W.E., 'The Case of the Tidy Tomb: The Place of the Napkins of John 11.44 and 20.7', *HeyJ* 14 (1973), pp. 47-57.

Robinson, J.A.T., *The Priority of John* (ed. J.F. Coakley; London: SCM Press, 1985).

Ruckstuhl, E., *Die literarische Einheit des Johannesevangeliums* (Freiburg: Paulus, 1951; repr.; NTOA, 5; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987).

—'Johannine Language and Style: The Question of their Unity', in M. de Jonge (ed.), *L'évangile de Jean* (BETL, 44; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1977), pp. 125-47.

Ruckstuhl, E., and Dschulnigg, P., *Stilkritik und Vertassertrage im Johanneserangelium: Dic johanneischen Sprachmerkmale auf dem Hintergrund des Neuen Testaments und des zeitgenössischen hellenistischen Schrifttums* (NTOA: Freiburg: Universitatsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991).

Sabbe, M., 'The Anointing of Jesus in John 12.1-8 and its Synoptic Parallels', in F. van Segbroeck *et al.* (eds.), *The Four Gospels 1992* (Festschrift Frans Neirynck; BETL, 100; 3 vols.; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), III, pp. 2051-82.

Sanders, J.N., ' "Those whom Jesus Loved" (John xi. 5)', *NTS* 1 (1954–55), pp. 29-41.

—*A Commentary on the Gospel According to St John* (ed. B.A. Mastin; London: A. & C. Black, 1968).

Schnackenburg, R., *The Gospel According to St John* (3 vols.; New York: Herder & Herder; London: Burns & Oates, 1968–82).

—*Die Johannesbriefe* (HTKNT, 13; Freiburg: Herder, 1975).

—*The Johannine Epistles* (trans. R. Fuller and I. Fuller; New York: Crossroad, 1992).

Schneiders, S.M., 'Women in the Fourth Gospel and the Role of Women in the Contemporary Church', in M.W.G. Stibbe (ed.), *The Gospel of John as Literature: An Anthology of Twentieth-Century Perspectives* (NTTS, 17; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1993), pp. 123-43.

Schuchard, B.G., *Scripture within Scripture: The Interrelationship of Form and Function in the Explicit Old Testament Citations in the Gospel of John* (SBLDS, 133; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992).

Schüssler Fiorenza, E., *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins* (London: SCM Press, 1983).

Schweizer, E., *The Good News According to Mark* (trans. D.H. Madvig; Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1970).

—*The Good News According to Matthew* (trans. D.E. Green; London: SPCK, 1976).

Scott, M., *Sophia and the Johannine Jesus* (JSNTSup, 71; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992).

Sloyan, G.S., *John* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1988).

Smalley, S.S., *1, 2, 3 John* (WBC, 51; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1984).

Smith, D. Moody, *Johannine Christianity: Essays on its Setting, Sources, and Theology* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1987).

—*John among the Gospels* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992).

Spicq, C., *Agapè dans le Nouveau Testament* (EBib; 3 vols.; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1959–66).

Sproston, W.E., 'Satan in the Fourth Gospel', in E.A. Livingstone (ed.), *Studia Biblica 1978: II. Papers on The Gospels* (JSNTSup, 2; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980), pp. 307-311.

—'"The Scripture" in John 17.12', in B.P. Thompson (ed.), *Scripture: Meaning and Method* (Festschrift Anthony Tyrrell Hanson; Hull: Hull University Press, 1987), pp. 24-36.

—'Witnesses to what was ἀπ' ἀρχῆς: 1 John's Contribution to Our Knowledge of Tradition in the Fourth Gospel', *JSNT* 48 (1992), pp. 43-65; reprinted in Porter and Evans (eds.), *The Johannine Writings*, pp. 138-60.

—'Jesus' Prayer in John 11', in S. Moyise (ed.), *The Old Testament in the New Testament* (Festschrift J.L. North; JSNTSup, 189; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), pp. 164-80.

Staley, J.L., *The Print's First Kiss: A Rhetorical Investigation of the Implied Reader in the Fourth Gospel* (SBLDS, 82; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988).

Stanton, G.N., *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1992).

Stibbe, M.W.G., *John as Storyteller: Narrative Criticism and the Fourth Gospel* (SNTSMS, 73; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

—'The Elusive Christ: A New Reading of the Fourth Gospel', *JSNT* 44 (1991), pp. 19-37, now reprinted in *idem* (ed.), *The Gospel of John as Literature: An Anthology of Twentieth-Century Perspectives* (NTTS, 17; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1993), pp. 231-47.

—'A Tomb with a View: John 11.1-44 in Narrative-Critical Perspective', *NTS* 40 (1994), pp. 38-54.

—*John's Gospel* (New Testament Readings; London: Routledge, 1994).

Story, C.I.K., 'The Mental Attitude of Jesus at Bethany: John 11.33, 38', *NTS* 37 (1991), pp. 51-66.

Strack, H.L. and P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* (5 vols.; Munich, C.H. Beck, 1956–61).

Strecker, G., 'Die Anfänge der johanneischen Schule', *NTS* 32 (1986), pp. 31-47.

—*Die Johannesbriefe* (Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament, 40; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989).

Strelan, R., 'Recognizing the Gods (Acts 14.8-10)', *NTS* 46 (2000), pp. 488-503.

Sylva, D., 'Nicodemus and his Spices (John 19.39)', *NTS* 34 (1988), pp. 148-51.

Taeger, J.-W., 'Der konservative Rebell: Zum Widerstand des Diotrephes gegen den Presbyter', *ZNW* 78 (1987), pp. 267-87.

Tanzer, S.J., 'Salvation is *for* the Jews: Secret Christian Jews in the Gospel of John', in B.A. Pearson (ed.), *The Future of Early Christianity: Essays in Honor of Helmut Koester* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), pp. 285-300.

Tarelli, C.C., 'Johannine Synonyms', *JTS* 47 (1946), pp. 175-77.

Thyen, H., 'Die Erzählung von den Bethanischen Geschwistern (Joh 11, 1-12, 19) als "Palimpsest" über Synoptischen Texten', in F. van Segbroeck *et al.* (eds.), *The Four Gospels 1992* (Festschrift Frans Neirynck; BETL, 100; 3 vols.; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), pp. 2021-2050

Van der Loos, H., *The Miracles of Jesus* (NovTSup, 8; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1965).

Vermes, G., *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 4th rev. edn, 1995).

Wagner, J., *Auferstehung und Leben: Joh 11,1-12,19 als Spiegel johanneischer Redaktions- und Theologiegeschichte* (Biblische Untersuchungen, 19; Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1988).

Watson, D.F., 'Amplification Techniques in 1 John: The Interaction of Rhetorical Style and Invention', *JSNT* 51 (1993), pp. 99-123.

Westcott, B.F., *The Gospel According to St. John* (London: John Murray, 1882).

—*The Epistles of St John* (London: Macmillan, 3rd edn, 1892).

Whitacre, R.A., *Johannine Polemic: The Role of Tradition and Theology* (SBLDS, 67; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982).

Wilcox, M., 'The Composition of John 13.21-30', in E.E. Ellis and M. Wilcox (eds.), *Neotestamentica et Semitica: Studies in Honour of Matthew Black* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1969), pp. 143-56.

—'The "Prayer" of Jesus in John XI.41b-42', *NTS* 24 (1977), pp. 128-32.

—'On Investigating the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament', in E. Best and R.McL. Wilson (eds.), *Text and Interpretation: Studies in the New Testament presented to Matthew Black* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), pp. 231-43.

Wilkens, W., 'Die Erweckung des Lazarus', *TZ* 15 (1959), pp. 22-39.

Wuellner, W., 'Putting Life Back into the Lazarus Story and its Reading: The Narrative Rhetoric of John 11 as the Narration of Faith', *Semeia* 53 (1991), pp. 113-32.

INDEXES

INDEX OF REFERENCES

OLD TESTAMENT

Genesis
4 68
4.8 69

Leviticus
24.16 61

Deuteronomy
6.5 47
6.13 48

Job
14.6 137

Psalms
8.4 87
10.34 93
82.6 93
117.21 LXX 115
118 144
118.21 115, 157
118.22 157
118.26 144
118.41 144

Isaiah
25.7-8 160

Daniel
7.13-14 87
7.13 87, 95
12.2 88, 95-97, 139, 140

Hosea
6.1-2 137

NEW TESTAMENT

Matthew
4.10 48
6.7 116
6.23 54
7.7-8 111, 116
7.7 114
7.9-11 113
9.1-8 120
9.2 60
9.3 60
9.6 60
9.8 60
9.18-26 122
9.18 94
9.24 94
9.30 149
11.5 58
16.28 73, 81
18.19-20 116
18.19 113
21.22 113, 117
21.42 157
24.31 100
26.6-13 121
26.6 121
26.37 153
26.38-39 153
26.38 147
27.46 100
27.50 100
27.60 155

Mark
1.43 149
2.1-12 120
2.4 60
2.5 60
2.7 60
2.9 60
5.21-43 58
5.22 147
5.23 140
5.24 140
5.35 146
5.39 94, 139, 140
8.12 153
8.22-26 120
8.34 57
8.38 80, 81, 87
9.1 73-75, 77-82, 87

Mark (cont.)
9.7 80
9.14-29 150
10.45 21, 39
11.9 144
11.24 113, 117
12.10-11 157
13.30 80
14.3-9 121
14.3 121, 151
14.4 151
14.5 149, 151, 153
14.6-8 152
14.10 152
14.33 153
14.34-36 153
14.34 147
15.46 155

Luke
1.13 116
2.37 48
4.8 48
5.17-26 120
5.19 60
5.20 60
5.21 60
5.24 60
7.1-10 120
7.11-17 122
7.11-15 58
7.22 58
7.36-50 119
7.38 119, 121, 153
8.35 118
8.40-56 122
8.49 146
8.52 94
9.27 73
10 119
10.30-37 119
10.38-42 118
10.38-39 142
10.38 118, 119
10.39 118, 145, 146
10.40 118
11.9-10 111
11.11-13 113
16.19-31 119
16.27-31 121
16.30-31 120
20.17 157
22.3 118

John
1.1-18 28
1.1 162
1.4 28, 123
1.9 107
1.11 33
1.12-13 63
1.12 33
1.14 31, 136, 163
1.16 31
1.18 18, 24, 99
1.19-27 132
1.19 131
1.20 107, 132
1.27 107
1.28 132
1.29 34, 39, 163
1.30 107
1.34 107
1.36 163
1.41 107
1.49 107
1.51 33
2 21, 124, 136
2.1-11 138
2.3 41
2.11 136, 156
2.19 160
2.20 42
2.22 18
2.23-24 125
2.23 125, 133
2.24 125
2.30-31 18
3 84
3.1 125, 126, 133
3.2 125, 133
3.4 42
3.10 125
3.11-12 125
3.11 33
3.12 33
3.15-16 72
3.15 84
3.16-21 22, 83, 84, 87, 89, 158
3.16-17 39, 84, 158
3.16 22, 84, 163
3.17 39, 84, 99, 163
3.18 87, 163
3.19-21 89
3.19-20 124
3.19 68
3.20 89
3.28 107, 132
3.32-33 33
3.34 66, 99
3.36 72, 84
4.9-10 39
4.14 72
4.25 66
4.34 66, 99, 114
4.39 125, 133
4.41-42 125
4.42 33, 35, 39
4.46-54 120, 130, 138
4.46 134
4.48 125
4.50 125
4.53 125
5 60, 79, 81, 82, 96, 98-100, 143, 146, 154

5.1-20 82
5.1-18 120
5.8 60
5.13 60
5.14 60
5.17 58, 60, 82, 84
5.18 60, 82-84, 124
5.19-47 60, 61
5.19-29 158
5.19-23 87
5.19 58, 83, 99
5.20 88
5.21-30 90
5.21-29 96
5.21-23 87
5.21-22 83, 88
5.21 84, 86, 87, 97, 146, 156
5.22-30 73
5.22 84, 87
5.23 73, 82, 83, 99
5.24-29 59-61, 81-83, 85, 89-91, 95, 96, 99, 130
5.24 25, 28, 61, 69, 71-73, 79-88, 91, 93-96, 98, 99, 125, 130, 136, 146, 158, 162
5.25-29 82, 158
5.25 61, 85, 86, 88, 93, 95, 98, 100, 136, 146, 158
5.26-30 90
5.26-27 85
5.26 28, 87, 97, 146
5.27-29 146
5.27 87, 88, 95, 101
5.28-29 61, 85, 88, 89, 97, 100, 146, 158
5.28 100
5.29 88, 95-97
5.30 66, 99
5.32 32
5.36 99
5.38 66
5.44 99
5.45 28
6 96, 97, 123, 130
6.2 125
6.5 72, 97
6.14 107, 125, 144
6.26 125
6.27 72
6.30 125
6.38 66, 99
6.39 63, 96, 97
6.40 63, 72, 96, 97
6.41-42 125
6.42 42
6.44 63, 96, 97
6.47 72, 97
6.51 72, 97
6.52 42, 125
6.54 63, 72, 96, 97
6.57 97
6.58 97
6.60-71 63
6.63 28, 97, 125
6.64 64
6.66 26, 63, 130
6.68-69 76, 97
6.68 28
6.70-71 64
7.2-14 138
7.7 40, 68
7.12 125, 154
7.13 124
7.16 66, 99
7.18 99
7.19 124, 125
7.20 125
7.25-27 125
7.29 66
7.31-32 127, 133
7.31 125, 133
7.35-36 125
7.35 42, 133
7.40-44 125
7.40-43 154
7.50 134
7.51 125
8 68, 79, 143
8.3-31 133
8.12 55, 139, 163
8.15 73
8.16 73, 99
8.17 125
8.22 42
8.23 124
8.26 73
8.29 114
8.30-31 125
8.31-59 64
8.31 64, 66
8.35 66
8.37-47 124
8.37 66
8.39-44 13
8.41 68
8.43 73
8.47 73
8.48 78

John (cont.)
8.49 73
8.50 73
8.51/52 74, 78, 79, 82, 98
8.51 28, 72-74, 80, 82, 92-94, 98, 136, 162
8.52 28, 73, 74, 78-82, 92-94, 98, 136, 162
8.55 66
8.59 124
9 123
9.1-41 120
9.3 136
9.4-5 139
9.4 55, 99
9.5 55, 163
9.16 154
9.22 64, 124
9.31 96, 102, 106, 143, 154, 156, 157
9.34 124
10 36, 47, 51, 52, 131
10.1-18 52
10.1 52
10.3 100, 146, 159
10.4 100
10.10 72, 131
10.11-18 51, 52
10.11 36, 45, 46, 52, 131
10.15 36, 45, 47, 52, 66, 131
10.16 100
10.17-18 45, 131, 160
10.17 36, 52
10.18 36, 160
10.19-21 125, 154
10.21 154
10.22-39 49
10.26-28 52
10.27-28 72
10.27 100
10.28 131
10.31-33 123, 124, 131, 139
10.31 50, 52
10.33 60
10.34-38 61
10.34-36 93
10.34 125
10.36 93, 99, 107
10.38 119
10.39 131
10.40 49, 132, 138, 143
10.41-42 133, 134
10.41 125, 132
10.42 133
11 15, 21, 49, 58, 59, 90, 91, 96, 100, 116, 118, 123, 127, 132, 144
11.1–12.11 127
11.1-44 40, 52, 138
11.1-16 127
11.1 119, 121, 134
11.2 119, 124, 134, 135, 142, 152
11.3-5 51
11.3 41, 42, 49, 51, 53, 134, 135, 152
11.4 50, 91-93, 95, 98, 103, 139, 140, 156
11.5 41, 137, 138, 142, 152
11.6 137
11.7-16 54, 90, 138
11.7-8 54, 132
11.7 54-56, 138, 141
11.8 50, 52, 54, 56, 123, 124, 139
11.9-10 54, 55, 139, 163
11.9 54, 55
11.10 54
11.11-14 56
11.11-13 95
11.11 51, 56, 57, 94-96, 101, 103, 139, 140, 161
11.12-14 139
11.12 134, 140
11.13-14 92, 140
11.13 140
11.14-15 143
11.14 56
11.15-16 56
11.15 56, 57, 132, 141, 158
11.16 50, 56, 132, 141
11.17-19 141
11.17 58, 92, 106, 114,

	115, 132, 137, 138, 156	11.34	134, 153		144, 152
		11.35	148, 153	12.1-8	121, 127, 134, 151
		11.36-37	126		
11.18-19	142	11.36	42, 50, 51, 154	12.1-2	135
11.18	121, 140			12.1	119, 121, 122, 146
11.19	126, 133, 142, 145	11.37	102, 123, 133, 156	12.2	119, 127, 152
11.20-37	142	11.38-44	127		
11.20-27	138, 152	11.38	99, 114, 153-55, 159	12.3	119, 124, 152, 153, 161
11.20	119, 142				
11.21-27	96				
11.21	106, 119, 132, 134, 142, 147, 156	11.39-40	115	12.4-5	152
		11.39	58, 92, 106, 115, 119, 134, 156, 161	12.7-8	152
				12.7	135
				12.9-11	127
11.22	105, 106, 108-10, 113, 114, 143, 147, 154, 157	11.40	103, 128, 136, 141, 156, 158	12.9	126, 127, 135, 146
				12.10-11	127
		11.41-42	99, 102, 105, 115, 116, 117, 143, 156	12.10	58, 127, 133, 160
11.23	96, 143, 156			12.11	127, 133
				12.12-19	127, 135, 144
11.24	63, 96, 97, 143	11.41	99, 102, 103, 115, 116, 157, 159	12.13	144, 157
				12.16	18
11.25-26	58, 96, 99, 114, 115, 141, 143, 156			12.17-18	126, 135
				12.17	127, 146
		11.42	99, 104, 115, 116, 158	12.19	127
11.25	97, 98			12.27-28	105
11.26	98, 158			12.27	147, 153
11.27	107, 134, 143, 156, 157	11.43-44	58, 100, 146, 158	12.28-30	158
				12.29	158
		11.43	99-101, 158	12.31	66, 124
11.28-29	119, 145, 146			12.33	47
		11.44	99, 159	12.34	66
11.28	145, 146	11.45-53	50, 145	12.35-36	163
11.30	142	11.45-48	127	12.35	55, 139
11.31	145, 146	11.45-46	126, 154	12.36	55
11.32-37	145	11.45	133, 135, 158	12.37-40	33
11.32-33	135, 152			12.42-43	126
11.32	106, 119, 132, 134, 142, 146	11.47-53	131	12.42	64, 124, 126, 133
		11.50-52	52		
		11.50	36, 50	12.43	126
11.33-35	41, 50	11.52	36, 50	12.44-50	97
11.33	103, 126, 147, 148, 150, 152, 155	11.53	124, 127, 133	12.45	99
				12.46	55, 139, 163
		12	123, 124, 127, 135,	12.48-50	66

John (cont.)
12.48 63, 96
12.49 99
13–16 33
13 46
13.2 13, 64, 152
13.3 47
13.4 152
13.14-15 52
13.21 147, 150, 153
13.23 18, 53
13.25-26 18
13.27 13, 64, 152
13.29 152
13.30 55
13.31 47
13.33 34
13.34 34, 36, 42-44, 46, 70
13.35 36, 46
13.36-37 46
13.36 47
13.37-38 47, 51, 52
13.37 36, 46, 47
13.38 36, 46, 47
14.1 33
14.3 33
14.5 57, 141
14.7 66
14.9 99
14.13-14 34, 110, 116
14.15 113
14.16-17 163
14.16 23, 34, 163
14.17 34
14.18 33
14.19 159
14.24 66, 99
14.26 18, 23,
14.27
14.30
14.31–18.1 45
15–17 45, 123
15 48
15.6 63
15.7 34, 66, 110, 113
15.10 113, 114
15.11 34
15.12 34
15.12-17 46, 48, 131
15.12-14 44
15.12-13 13
15.12 42-44, 46, 70, 113
15.13 35, 39, 43-46, 49-53, 56, 131, 135, 139, 146, 154
15.14-15 51
15.14 44, 46
15.15 66
15.16 34, 110, 116, 131
15.17 42-44, 46, 70, 113
15.18–16.4 40, 33, 48
15.18-19 40
15.20 18
15.25 125
15.26 18, 23, 34, 163
15.27 28
16.1 63
16.2 48, 53, 61, 64, 124
16.7-15 34
16.7 23, 163
16.12-15 18
16.20 34
16.22 34
16.23 34
16.23-26 111, 116
16.23-24 111, 131
16.24 34
16.26 110
16.30 66
16.33 33, 66
17 105, 130
17.1 158
17.3 66
17.8 99
17.11 63, 66
17.12 64, 66
17.14 40, 66
17.15 66
17.18 99
17.21-23 63
17.21 99
17.23 99
17.25 66, 99
18 52
18.1-11 52
18.9 134
18.13 134
18.14 134
18.15-27 47
18.32 47, 134
19.7 61
19.15 124
19.26-27 18
19.26 53
19.35 32
19.38-40 125
19.38 124
19.39 125, 134
19.40 159
19.41-42 153
20 124, 154-57, 160
20.1 155, 156
20.2 53, 153
20.5-7 159
20.7 159
20.8-9 18

20.9 157
20.11-18 146
20.11 146
20.13 153
20.15 153
20.16-17 147
20.16 146
20.19 124
20.24-29 57, 141
20.30-31 45
20.31 32, 107, 144
21 45, 46, 48, 78, 79, 95, 123
21.7 18, 53
21.9 47
21.15-19 47, 48, 52
21.15-17 47
21.17 51, 66
21.18-19 51, 75
21.18 47
21.19 47, 75
21.20-23 75
21.20 53, 134
21.21-23 74, 82, 95
21.22-23 65, 76, 79, 92
21.22 47, 75, 76, 78
21.23 75, 76, 78, 79, 95
21.24 31, 32
21.25 40

Acts
4.11 157
7.34 116
10.31 116

Romans
1.9 48
1.25 48
8.31-32 22
9.4 48
12.1 48

1 Corinthians
7.39 94
11.16 27
11.30 94
15.6 94
15.11 27
15.12-19 159
15.18 94
15.20 94
15.23 94
15.51 94

2 Corinthians
5.19 22, 39
6.2 116

Galatians
1.4 22
1.13-14 48
2.20 22, 39
4.4-5 22

Ephesians
5.2 39
5.14 94

Philippians
3.5-6 48

1 Thessalonians
1.10 94
4.13-16 94
4.16 94, 100

2 Thessalonians
2.3 62
2.8 62
2.9 62

1 Timothy
1.15 22, 39
2.4 22
2.5-6 39
3.16 22

Titus
2.11 22

Hebrews
2.6 87
2.9 74
5.7 116, 154
8.4-5 48
9.6 48
9.9 48
10.1-2 48

James
1.5-6 117
1.6 113

1 Peter
2.4-5 157
2.7 157

2 Peter
3.4 94

1 John
1.1-3 14, 27
1.1 13, 23, 27, 31
1.2 33
1.3 13, 27, 144
1.4-5 163
1.4 27
1.5 23, 28, 66, 163
1.6 13, 29
1.7 13
1.8-10 29
1.8 67
1.9 29, 67, 163
1.10 23, 67
1.23 27
2.1 23, 67, 163
2.2 29, 34, 35, 39, 163
2.3-6 42

1 John (cont.)
2.3 66
2.4-6 29
2.4 66
2.5 23
2.7-11 68
2.7-8 30, 42, 43
2.7 23, 28, 43, 65, 68, 71, 80
2.8 28, 42, 63, 65, 66
2.9-11 29, 68
2.10 66
2.12-14 28, 66
2.14 23
2.15-17 29
2.17 63, 66
2.18 62, 64
2.19 12, 25, 26, 63, 65
2.20-21 28, 66
2.20 66
2.22-24 25
2.22 62, 66, 144
2.23-24 66
2.25 67
2.26-27 28
2.27 66
2.28 63, 65
2.29 28, 29, 63
3 67
3.1 28, 63
3.2 63
3.3 42
3.4 28
3.5-8 28
3.5 29, 34, 35, 39, 163
3.6-8 29
3.6 29
3.7-8 68
3.7 29, 42, 68
3.9 29, 67, 92
3.10 42, 67, 68
3.11-18 25
3.11 30, 43, 44, 68, 70, 80
3.12-15 30
3.12 13, 29, 68
3.13 40, 68, 69
3.14 24, 25, 29, 68-71, 79, 93
3.15 68, 96
3.16-18 30, 44
3.16 13, 30, 35, 39, 43, 44, 46, 49
3.17-18 43
3.17 30, 45, 46, 48
3.18 23, 30
3.19-24 42
3.19-20 108
3.19 163
3.21-23 110
3.21 28, 108, 113
3.22-24 42
3.22-23 113
3.22 108, 109
3.23 42, 109, 110, 144
3.24 113
3.8 29
4.2-3 25
4.3 62, 65, 66
4.4 66
4.5 33
4.7-12 42
4.8 29
4.9-10 84, 158, 163
4.9 31, 163
4.10 29
4.12 24
4.14 33, 35, 39
4.16 31
4.17-18 65
4.17 42, 63
4.20 24, 29
5 115
5.2-3 42
5.4 66
5.5 66
5.10-15 107
5.10 107
5.11 28
5.12 107
5.13-20 107
5.13 28, 32, 107, 109, 110
5.14-21 110
5.14-16 109, 110
5.14-15 91, 115, 116
5.14 66, 107, 108, 109, 113
5.15 107
5.16-17 29, 91, 93, 108
5.16 67, 91-93, 109, 113
5.17 91
5.18 29, 66, 67, 92
5.19 66, 67
5.20 66, 144

2 John
7 62

3 John
12 32

Revelation
1.10 101
1.13-16 101
1.13 87, 101
2.11 74
12 62
14.14 87
20.6 74
20.14 74
21.3 101
21.8 74

OTHER ANCIENT REFERENCES

Pseudepigrapha
T. Benj.
10.8 88

Qumran
1QH
6.29-34 86
6.29 88
6.34 88

4Q521 frag.
2 86

Mishnah
Ber.
9.5 47

INDEX OF AUTHORS

Alexander, N. 108, 112
Allison, D.C. 111, 112, 116
Ashton, J. 46, 52, 54, 61, 81, 83, 123, 126, 128, 131, 144

Bailey, J.L. 60
Bammel, E. 132
Barrett, C.K. 21, 22, 41, 51, 52, 54, 55, 59, 64, 67, 70, 71, 73-75, 77, 78, 81, 83, 84, 86, 88, 94, 96-99, 102-104, 106, 112, 120, 121, 134, 136, 137, 139, 142, 145-49, 153-56, 159
Bartholomew, G.L. 51, 85
Bassler, J.M. 125
Beare, F.W. 81
Beasley-Murray, G.R. 22, 32, 57, 59, 73, 74, 77, 78, 86, 91, 96-98, 100, 104, 106, 128, 134, 137, 142-45, 148, 149, 159
Belle, G. van 128, 134, 135
Bernard, J.H. 22, 54, 55, 74, 78, 87, 88, 91, 92, 94, 100, 102, 103
Best, E. 80
Beutler, J. 36
Billerbeck, P. 89
Black, M. 149
Boer, M.C. de 19
Boismard, M.-E. 129, 136, 137
Bonnard, P. 23
Borgen, P. 20, 83
Brooke, A.E. 24, 67, 108, 112
Brooke, G.J. 86
Brown, R.E. 11-14, 18, 23, 24, 27, 38, 42, 43, 45, 53-55, 57, 59, 62, 66-69, 73, 75, 77, 78, 86, 88, 90, 92, 93, 96-98, 100, 102-104, 106, 107-109, 111-13, 116, 119-21, 123, 126, 129, 131, 134, 137, 139, 141, 142, 144, 145, 148, 155, 156
Browning, R. 135
Bruce, F.F. 67
Bultmann, R. 41, 51, 55, 57, 67, 73, 77, 83, 84, 87, 89-91, 96-98, 100, 103, 104, 106, 110, 115, 120, 134, 136, 137, 139, 142, 143, 147-49, 158, 159
Burkett, D. 129, 162

Carrez, M. 27
Carson, D.A. 51, 59, 87, 88, 96, 98, 103, 106
Casey, P.M. 80
Chapman, J. 32
Chilton, B. 69
Cosgrove, C.H. 26
Culpepper, R.A. 19, 31, 51, 52, 78, 96, 125, 134, 140, 144, 160

Danke, F.W. 126
Davey, J.E. 103
Davies, M. 61, 135
Davies, W.D. 111, 112, 116
Dibelius 143
Dodd, C.H. 20, 36, 55, 57, 59, 62, 67, 91, 97, 98, 100, 104, 108, 109, 111-13, 116, 120, 122-24, 129, 131
Dschulnigg, P. 19, 128

Edwards, R.B. 13, 52, 64
Elliott, J.K. 144
Ellis, P.F. 31
Evans, E. 51

Fitzmyer, J.A. 74
Fortna, R.T. 20, 120, 128, 136, 137, 139, 142, 145, 149, 154, 158, 159
Freyne, S. 124, 125
Fuller, R.H. 104

García Martínez, F. 86
Gaventa, B.B. 46
Giblin, C.H. 138
Goldsmith, D. 39, 113, 116
Goulder, M.D. 21, 76, 126
Grayston, K. 11, 23, 57, 67, 106, 108, 112, 123, 134
Guilding, A. 137
Gundry, R.H. 151
Günther, W. 51

Haenchen, E. 74, 92, 106
Hanson, A.T. 103, 114, 137
Hartin, P.J. 111
Hayman, P. 61
Hengel, M. 20, 26, 54
Holtzman, H.J. 102
Horbury, W. 60
Horsley, G.H.R. 94
Hoskyns, E.C. 41, 77, 78, 103, 105, 116, 157
Houlden, J.L. 11, 27, 108
Howard, W.F. 20

Jeremias, J. 89
Jonge, M. de 125

Kermode, F. 100, 123
Kittel, G. 115
Kitzburger, I.R. 135, 138
Kremer, J. 120, 129, 134, 136, 137, 147, 148, 159, 160
Künzi, M. 79
Kysar, R. 45, 63

Lagrange, M.-J. 103
Lamouille, 129
Law, R. 70
Lee, D.A. 123, 124, 127, 128, 131, 134, 137, 145, 148, 149, 156, 160
Lieu, J.M. 11, 13, 25, 27, 28, 35, 38, 42, 43, 63, 65-70
Lightfoot, R.H. 51
Lindars, B. 20-22, 40, 46, 48, 49, 52, 53, 56, 59-61, 64, 73, 74, 78, 81, 83, 84, 86-88, 90, 92, 96, 97, 100-104, 106, 112, 113, 116, 119, 120, 121-24, 127, 129-32, 134, 135, 138, 141-43, 145-51, 153-56, 158, 159
Loader, W. 67, 109, 112
Loisy, A. 102
Longenecker, B.W. 64, 126
Louw, J.P. 51, 132

Malatesta, E. 75
Mansoor, M. 86, 88
Marcus, J. 87, 157
Marsh, J. 92
Marshall, I.H. 108, 109
Martyn, J.L. 60
Metzger, B.M. 97, 118, 120
Minear, P.S. 31, 45
Moloney, F.J. 87, 90
Moody Smith, D. 81
Moore, A.L. 74
Moore, G.F. 115
Morgenthaler, R. 24
Moule, C.F.D. 98, 148
Mourlon Beernart, P. 124
Moyise, S. 101
Muraoka, T. 151

Nardoni, E. 80
Neirynck, F. 21, 81, 135, 137, 159
Nicol, W. 125, 128, 137, 138, 141, 149
North, J.L. 151

Okure, T. 11
Ong, W.J. 85
Osborne, B. 160

Painter, J. 13
Parker, P. 132
Perkins, P. 85
Piper, O.A. 31, 71
Pollard, T.E. 137, 142, 147, 148
Ponthot, J. 41, 143
Puech, E. 86

Quast, K.B. 18, 76

Reiser, W.E. 160
Robinson, J.A.T. 60
Ruckstuhl, E. 19, 20, 36, 96, 98, 128

Sabbe, M. 121, 135, 152

Sanders, J.N. 103, 106, 112, 116, 144
Schnackenburg, R. 22, 51, 59, 62, 65, 70, 75-79, 84, 86-88, 90, 93, 95, 96, 100, 103, 104, 106, 108, 109, 111, 112, 115, 116, 120, 122, 123, 129, 130, 134, 136-39, 142, 145, 147-49, 153, 155, 158
Schneiders, S.M. 144
Schuchard, B.G. 52
Schüssler Fiorenza, E. 144
Schweizer, E. 81
Scott, M. 119, 125, 143, 144, 147, 148
Sloyan, G.S. 59, 131
Smalley, S.S. 34, 63, 67, 108, 113
Spicq, C. 51
Sproston, W.E. 15, 64, 102, 121, 152
Staley, J.L. 140
Stanton, G.N. 85
Stibbe, M.W.G. 11, 52, 53, 64, 98, 100, 124, 135, 137, 144
Story, C.I.K. 148
Strack, H.L. 89
Strecker, G. 38, 62, 65, 112
Strelan, R. 101
Sylva, D. 160

Taeger, J.-W. 27
Tanzer, S.J. 126
Tarelli, C.C. 84
Thyen, H. 128, 135

Van der Loos, H. 104
Vander Broek, L.D. 60
Vermes, G. 86, 88

Wagner, J. 129, 158
Watson, D.F. 85
Westcott, B.F. 24, 55, 67
Whitacre, R.A. 26, 43, 63, 64, 93
Wilcox, M. 20, 21, 47, 69, 114, 156-58
Wilkens, W. 129, 134, 136, 149, 158